

THE
SEVERAL WAYS
Of Resolving
FAITH,
IN THE
ROMAN and REFORMED
CHURCHES.

With the Authors impartial
thoughts upon each of them.

And his own Opinion at length shewn,
wherein the Rule of Faith
doth consist.

Which clears upon rational Grounds
the Church of *England* from crimi-
nal Schism and laies the Cause
of the separation upon the
Roman.

Y O R K. Printed by *Stephen Bulkley,*
and are to be sold by *Richard Lambart*
Book-seller in the Minster-yard.

1 6 7 7.

THE
SHEPHERD

AND
HIS FLOCK

BY
J. H. B. B. B.

IN
THE

THE

THE

THE

THE

THE

I



gr
th
hi
by
th
th
Er
it
cer
3

THE
PUBLISHER,
To the
Pious and Intelligent
READER.



F, Reader, thou be indeed so qualified, as the style I give thee, imports, the following Treatise will, I am confident, find a very gratefull acceptance with thee. For as the Subject of it's Discourse is of highest Consequence, and so esteem'd by all who have a greater value for the Truth of Christianity, then for the Concern of secular Interests and Enjoyments; so will the handling of it be, with that impartiality, sincerity, and seriousness seen perform'd, that

The Publisher to the Pious

that thou'lt easily own it to be
Tract wholly design'd for conviction
and satisfaction, not at all for con-
tention or ostentation. This, 'tis true,
makes it appear in a plain and
homely dress, the Author having
purposely declin'd Rhetoricall Orna-
ments as fitter for an eloquent in-
sinuating Harangue, then for a con-
troversiall strict Discourse, whose
aime and intent should not be to
please the Phansie with gay and emp-
ty appearances, but to fix the Un-
derstanding with plain and solid
Truths. Whereunto how far this
small Piece in what it treats of, is
conducible, I shall wholly leave to
thy own impartiall thoughts to judge.
Permit me yet (which with modesty
enough, I may crave) to use the
freedome to tell thee, that the Way
the Author takes for effecting his de-
fire (which is to be confirm'd upon
sure Grounds, What the Means in-

and Intelligent Reader.

stituted by God, for attaining to the certain knowledge of Christs Doctrine) is such, that nothing but very calumny can accuse him of any sinister or partiall proceeding. This although a Motive materiall for recommending the perusall of his Book, especially considering how polemick Disputes are too frequently mannag'd, yet was my apprehension of the soundness of the Discourse it self, and of the great assistance it brings to the rationall defence of the truly Protestant Profession (but not of whatsoever is so call'd by every Opinionist) the principall Inducement that mov'd me (with my friends permission) to publish it. I speak not this (Courteous Reader) to forestall in the least thy Judgement, but remit thee to thy full liberty; and the rather, because to do otherwise, were to offer violence to the nature of the Treatise it selfe, whose entire
com-

The Publisher to the Pious &c.

complexion, in the whole and every part thereof, is ingenuous and free, looking on whatsoever is within it's prospect with the most equall eye imaginable, and yet passing over nothing of moment without a due inspection of it, as by an indifferent view thereof thou wilt easily perceive. Farewell.

The

The Contents.

SECTION 1. *There is a Rule of Christian Faith, or a Way whereby to come to the certain knowledge of Christs Doctrine, instituted by God. Three different Opinions among the Learned of the Roman Religion, where that Way is to be found; or wherein the Rule of Faith (as 'tis called by Controvertists) doth consist.*

SECT. 2. *The Ground of the first*

The Contents.

first Opinion of the Romanists (which places the Rule of Faith in the Definition of a General Council confirmed by the Pope) being this, That a General Council confirm'd by the Pope, cannot erre in Matters of Religion, seriously consider'd of, and thought to be erroneous.

Secd. 3. The Reason of the second Opinion among the Romish Party, (namely, That the Definition of a General Council conciliarly proceeding with, or without the Pope, is the Rule

The Contents.

Rule of Faith) held to be, That a General Council conciliarly acting is infallible in Catholick Points of Faith, taken into consideration ; and it's double meaning explain'd, the truth of which in one of them only is here brought to the Test ; the certainty of it, in it's other sense, being left to be examin'd in it's due place afterward.

Sect. 4. The Foundation, whereon we find the third Opinion of the Romanists (to wit, that Oral Tradition, or the living Voice of the Present Church

The Contents.

Church in every Age is the Rule of Faith) to be built, viz. That Tradition is in Articles of Faith perpetually the same in all Ages, well div'd into, and more largely (because of the present great vogue it has with the learned of the Romish Profession here in England) insisted on, then the Grounds of both the two former Opinions are.

SECT. 5. The Controvertists of the Reformed Church, make Scripture the Rule of Faith. Two main different Opinions,

not-

The Contents.

notwithstanding in what sense it is so held to be. The former Assertion, viz. That the Scripture is clear to every understanding illuminated by the Holy Ghost, in all those things which are necessary to salvation, thoroughly inspected and esteem'd to be more plausible than sound. A Sect, that holds private inspiration of the Spirit of God, absolutely necessary, as well for knowing, as understanding the Word of God. Another sort of People, who talk of a Light within them,

The Contents.

them, to be their sole Guide in Matters of Belief and Practice. Both these Pretensions fairly discuss'd, and found to be Delusions

Sect. 6. The other Assertion which some of the Reformed hold, viz. That all things necessary to Salvation, are clear in Scripture to every understanding, impartially reflected on, and Reasons given why 'tis thought to be rather popular and pleasing, then solid and satisfactory.

Sect. 7. Whether the Rule

The Contents.

of Faith affords infallible, or but moral certitude of Christs Doctrin. Whether we may not now in our days have as great certainty thereof, as the Disciples of the Apostles had. And whether the like certainty which they had be not enough for the Church of the present and future Ages.

SECT. 8. By what Means the knowledge of a Matter of Fact (such as the preaching of the Gospel by Christ and His Apostles was) may be

The Contents.

be perpetuated. An examination of the force of the Romanists main Argument whereby they endeavour to shew, that Scripture cannot be the Rule of Faith. Whether the Scripture be not as intelligent in Points of Faith as Tradition or the Living voice of the Church is.

Sect. 9. What the Properties of the Rule of Faith be, and whether they agree to Holy Scripture.

Sect.

The Contents.

Sect. 10. *An Enquiry, Whether Christs Doctrine has been practically convey'd without intermission from the days of the Apostles, unto ours. And of what validity four grand Arguments urg'd against the indefectibility of Tradition, are.*

Sect. 11. *What rational assurance we have, That Scripture is not corrupted in Necessaries to Salvation. The way to know what*
B . *Things*

The Contents:

Things have been ever
Orally taught. Two Rea-
sons given, why Tradition,
though it be of an indefe-
ctible Nature, should not
be the Rule of Faith.
Whether a Fundamental
Error, can ever obtain a
setled quiet possession in the
visible Church? An offer
from Reason for the im-
possibility of the thing. Er-
rors not-Fundamental, may
overspread the Church, or,
at least, a great and consi-
derable

The Contents.

derable part of it, and
why? Several Instances of
such Errors in the Roman
Church.

Se&. 12. That the Ho-
ly Scripture, or Written
Word of God, is the Rule
of Faith. That Tradition
is a necessary means where-
by to attain to the certain
knowledge thereof. That
the Multitude, or weakest
sort of Christians, are not
able of themselves, with-
out the help of others, to

The Contents.

resolve Faith aright, or be
rationally assur'd, what the
Doctrine of Salvation is.

SECT. 13. The harm
that may arise to the Church
from the belief of an Er-
ror not-Fundamental, to be
an Article of Faith. The
true stating of the diffe-
rence between the Church
of England, and the
Church of Rome. The
Church of England clear'd
from the guilt of Schism,
and the Roman justly
blam'd

The Contents.

blam'd for being Cause of
the separation. That the
joynt Concurrence of Scri-
pture and Oral Tradition,
(or the practical Delivery
of Christs Doctrine) was
recommended by the Bles-
sed Apostles to the Church;
the Restauration of which
Concurrence, (tis humbly
conceiv'd) would be a firm
Foundation for re-uniting
dissenting Christians in Mat-
ters of Religion; and the
Continuance of it a lasting
Means

The Contents.

**Means for perpetuating
Christianity in its Ancient
native Purity.**

Errata.

In the Contents, Sect. 6. l. 2. read for Reformed, Reformation. Sect. 8. l. 8. for intelligient intelligible.

Pag. 9. l. 15. r. but impious. p. 17. l. last (viz. p. 31. l. 1. r. Canonical Scripture. p. 32. l. 12. 13. r. Church diffusive. p. 40 l. 16. r. Efforts p. 47. l. 6. r. formerly. p. 62. l. 5, 6. r. to be perform'd; actually. p. 72. l. 7. r. so often as. p. 82 l. 2. r. as prone as possible. p. 91. l. 17. blot out if. p. 97. l. 10. r. die. l. 11. r. sedet. p. 99. l. 1. r. descendit. l. 13. r. obtemperantibus. p. 100. l. 1. r. Act. 4. 12. p. 101. l. 11. r. nascetur. p. 106. l. 3. r. descendet. p. 112. l. 15. r. in Scripture, as. l. 16. Traditionist. p. 113. l. 5 r. Traditionist. p. 121. l. 18. r. ascension. p. 122. l. 2. r. ascension p. 126, 127 r. of what validity Four—are? p. 128. l. 3. r. thus; l. 14. those p. 142. l. 15, 16. r. in the Creed there set forth. l. 18 and that also. p. 142. l. 23. r. or it is not; p. 143. l. 14. r. Latins. l. 19. Lombard. p. 144. l. 4. 5. r. in eandem nobiscum. l. 8. unam eandemq; fore sententiam. p. 145. l. 1. r. Quest. 36. p. 146. l. 5. r. diserte dicant. p. 154. l. 20. r. as an Article. p. 158. l. 7. r. superfluous. p. 161. l. 9. soever there be. p. 162. l. 10. r. and not to be extended. p. 170 l. 2. r. in such case. p. 171. l. 16. r. spilt. p. 179. l. 19. r. what they teach. p. 183. l. 4 r. Distinction. p. 192. l. 10. r. Lawd. p. 195. l. 13. r. Polemical

The rest are more obvious literal mistakes, in appearances, yeild, adhear, oblid'g, Antichrist, Writting, all be it, vulger, with some small characters for great, and great for small.

THE
OFFICE OF THE
SHERIFF OF THE COUNTY OF
SHERBORN
SHERBORN, ENGLAND

IN THE MATTER OF THE
ESTATE OF
THE SHERIFF OF THE COUNTY OF
SHERBORN
SHERBORN, ENGLAND

Fol

*The several Ways of resolving
Faith in the Roman and
Reformed Churches.*

*With the Authors impartial thoughts
upon each of them.*

*And his own Opinion at length shown,
wherein the Rule of Faith
doth consist.*

*Which clears upon rational Grounds the
Church of England from criminal
Schisme, and lays the Cause of the
separation upon the Roman.*

SECT. I.

*There is a Rule of Faith instituted by
God. Three different Opinions among
the Learned of the Roman Religion,
wherein that Rule doth consist.*

Since it was the Almightyes good
pleasure to create Man a reason-
able

*The several ways of resolving Faith-
ble Creature, it became his Divine
Wisdom and Goodness, not only to
ordain an End convenient for Him,
with Means likewise available there-
to; but also to constitute a Way by
which he might come to the certain
Knowledge of both: for in vain
would the two former have been in-
stituted without the last, when by
this alone, both the other were to
be made known unto Him.*

That therefore there is a *Way* or-
dain'd by God, whereby to under-
stand aright, *Mans Chief End*, and
the proper *Means* available to it, re-
mains without dispute. Yet such not-
withstanding is the difference and dis-
agreement amongst divers men of
greatest Wit and Learning about it,
that through their subtil Arguments,
and eager Zeal to defend every one
his espous'd Opinion, not a few sober
well minded *Christians* are brought
into a Labyrinth of intricate diffi-
culties

in the Roman, and Reformed Churches. 3

culties and doubts *what* they ought to beleeve ; whilst the *Controvertists* in Religion, though in general they acknowledge, that the *Gospel* of *Christ* published to the World, declares wherein Mans *Felicity*, and the *Means* thereof consist, yet are at perpetual discord *what* the particular *Doctrines* necessary to the Salvation of *Mankind*, contain'd in that *Gospel* or *Revelation*, be ; and that, because they cannot agree where the *Way* which leads to the certain knowledge of *Christs Doctrine* is to be found ; or, as for brevity 'tis phras'd, what the *Rule of Faith* is.

This gave the occasion of my undertaking the following Inquire ; the designe whereof, is to endeavour to the utmost of my power the gaining a well-grounded *satisfaction* in a matter of so great Concern, as the *Rule of Faith* is, to be truly known, For the compassing of which longing
C 2 desire

The several ways of resolving Faith
 desire of my heart, I judge it the
 best expedient, I know of, to take an
equal and impartial view of the *dis-*
fering Opinions about it ; that either,
 by comparing them together, I may
 be enabled to make a rational choice
 of some *one* before the rest ; or els
 to gather from the whole *disquisition*
 that *satisfaction* is not to be expected
 without a *further* enquiry to be made
wherein the Rule of *Christian Faith*
 doth really consist.

The first *difference* worthy of no-
 rice about the *Rule of Faith*, or the
Way which guides and directs to the
 clear knowledge of *Christs Doctrine*,
 is concerning the nature of the *assu-*
rance which it is to afford ; some
 affirming, that it ought to give *in-*
fallible certainty : whilst others say,
 that it needs only yield a *Moral* cer-
 titude, or such an assurance, as is
 sufficient to remove *actual* doubting,
 but not which renders it *impossible*
 to

in the Roman and Reformed Churches. 5

to be deceiv'd in *Matters of Faith.*

Those that hold the *Rule of Faith* to administer *infallible* certainty of *Christian Doctrine* are part of them of the *Roman* and part of the *Reformed Church*. Those who maintain the *contrary*, are only *some* of the *Reformed*. As to the *merit* of either opinion I'll leave the discussion of it to another place; and at present shew *wherein* the *Romish* Controversialists, of which there are *three* distinct sorts, place the *Rule of Faith*.

The first sort maintain, that *A General Council confirm'd by the Pope*, or (as the Proposition is render'd by some) *The Pope defining in a General Council cannot erre*; and so make, *The Definition of a General Council confirm'd by the Pope*; or *The Definition of the Pope, in a General Council*,
The Rule of Faith.

6 *The several ways of resolving Faith.*

The second sort affirm, That a General Council conciliarly proceeding, is before it's confirmation by the Pope, infallible in Matters of Faith; whence according to these men,

*The Definition of a General Council, conciliarly proceeding, is
The Rule of Faith.*

The third sort assert, That *The living voice of the Church, or Oral and practical Tradition, is in Articles of Faith perpetually the same in all Ages; and so will have,*

*Tradition, or the living Voice of the Church in every Age,
The Rule of Faith.*

SECT. II.

The first Opinion of the Romanists,
*That a General Council confirm'd
by*

in the Roman and Reformed Churches. 7

*by the Pope cannot erre, consider'd
of, and found erroneous.*

TO Argue here as some do,
That *A General Council* hath
either err'd, or not err'd before it be
confirm'd by the *Pope*; if it have
err'd the *Popes* Confirmation cannot
make an *Error* become a *Truth*: if
it have not err'd the Confirmation
addes nothing to the *truth* of the
definition; to Argue I say thus, is
more seemingly plausible, then home
to the Point. For to do them right
whose the Proposition is, their in-
tention in saying, *A General Coun-
cil confirm'd cannot erre*, tends only
to this, That the *Popes* Confirma-
tion, *infallibly shews* (not *makes*) the
Definition of the *Council* to be true,
of which there was no *infallible* cer-
tainty before. But then, this sup-
pos'd to be their meaning, the Pro-
position should of right, run (if pro-

8 *The several ways of resolving Faith*

perly) thus ; *The Pope confirming a General Council cannot erre*, which would, I conceive, be a false Assertion. For, if the *Council* should define an *Error*, thinking it to be a *Divine Truth*, the *Pope* might possibly (if not miraculously preserv'd from erring) be of the same mind with the other *Prelates* ; and if so, what should hinder him from confirming their Definition ? not his *Judgement*, for that we suppose to be the same with the *Councils*, nor his *Will* then certainly, otherwise he should refuse to do an act, which his *Judgement* told him ought to be done for the benefit of the *Church*. To say that the *Pope* is miraculously preserv'd from confirming an *erroneous Council*, would be too bold and gross a presumption, except the only way of coming to the knowledge of *Christs Doctrine* were by the Definition of a *General Council confirm'd by the Pope*,

in the Roman and Reformed Churches. 9

Pope, in that manner preserv'd: which thing if it were truly so in very deed, no Divine Revelation would be obliging in the nature of an Article of Faith, till declar'd one by such a Council; and consequently, there was no obligation to believe any Part of the Christian Religion in any Age, after the death of those who were taught it by the infallible Disciples of Christ, till the year of our Lord 325. in which the first Nicene Council was celebrated, nor much of it till long after; which certainly would not only be absurd, but impious also to say or think.

But may not perhaps the changing the Proposition from the *Pope confirming a General Council cannot erre*, to this, *The Pope Defining in a General Council cannot erre*, alter the Case? Not at all, I conceive, more then in bare words; for that which some of the *Romanists* call *defining*,
is

The several ways of resolving Faith,
 is the same thing with that which
 others of them name *confirming*,
 whilst both place the suppos'd *infalli-*
bility in the *Popes assent*; which *assent*
 those who call it *defining*, think per-
 haps they make the Proposition more
 obviously denote, that *Prelats infalli-*
bility, as exclusive of all the rest
 thereby.

SECT. III.

The second Opinion amongst the
Romanists, viz. That a General
 Council conciliary proceeding is in-
 fallible in Matters of Faith taken
 into consideration, and it's double
 meaning explain'd; the truth of
 which in one of them only is here
 brought to the Test, the certainty of
 it

in the Roman and Reformed Churches. 11

*it in it's other sense being left
to be examin'd in other Sections.*

THIS Assertion of the *Second* sort of *Romish Controvertists*, that *A General Council conciliarly proceeding cannot erre in Points of Faith*, may be taken in a two-fold sense, either as the words *conciliarly proceeding* include *Tradition*, which the *Traditionists* say; and then the meaning of it is, That *A General Council* defining according to *Tradition*, or the *living voice* of the *Church* cannot erre; in which sense, the consideration of it belongs to some following *Sections*: Or els as they are intended only to denote the exclusion of all *fraudulent* and *forceible* ways us'd to procure the votes of the *Prelats*, so as that the *Definition* of the *Council* being left to it's own *freedom* will be *infallibly true*, although the *Means* preparative to it, were not at all so,
Against

Against this Assertion I have somewhat here to say, which withholds my assent thereunto, and it is this.

'Tis well known to be the practice of all good *Councils* to use *endeavours* towards the discovery of *Truth*. Now those *endeavours* must cease either before the Matter under enquiry be so thoroughly discuss'd, that the *Means* us'd, evidently shew the truth, or not till the truth be manifestly discover'd by them: If not till the truth be manifestly discover'd by them, the *Definition* is then a necessary *Conclusion* drawn from the *Means* us'd, as from it's *Premisses* which being suppos'd not to be *infallible*, the *Definition* which is inferr'd from them, cannot be any more *infallible* then they; But if on the contrary, the *endeavours* of the *Council* may cease, before the truth be clearly discover'd by the *Means* us'd, it will be necessary that the *Prelats* certainly
know

know how *farr* their *endeavours* ought to proceed, before a *period* may *justly* be put to them, so as that a rational full assurance may be had, that the *Council* has perform'd the *Conditions* requir'd on it's part in order to the *sending* of the *Holy Ghost*; which when I see a *satisfactory* account given how it is to be done, I shall think I have cause to alter my thoughts from what at present they are.

But I meet with a late *Controversist* of the *Romish* Party, who yeilds, that the *Definition* of a *General Council*, is *not* immediately inspir'd by *God*; and yet sayes, that it is *suo modo* Divine. 'Tis true indeed, that whatsoever is deriv'd by *intermediat* Causes from *God*, the same is *suo modo* Divine; but he does not hold the *Definition* of a *General Council* to be the proper result of *intermediat* Causes, though depending on the first, for *such* he judges

in

Against this Assertion I have somewhat here to say, which withholds my assent thereunto, and it is this.

'Tis well known to be the practice of all good *Councils* to use *endeavours* towards the discovery of *Truth*. Now those *endeavours* must cease either before the Matter under enquiry be so thoroughly discuss'd, that the *Means* us'd, evidently shew the truth, or not till the truth be manifestly discover'd by them: If not till the truth be manifestly discover'd by them; the *Definition* is then a necessary *Conclusion* drawn from the *Means* us'd, as from it's *Premisses* which being suppos'd not to be *infallible*, the *Definition* which is inferr'd from them, cannot be any more *infallible* then they; But if on the contrary, the *endeavours* of the *Council* may cease, before the truth be clearly discover'd by the *Means* us'd, it will be necessary that the *Prelats* certainly know

know how *farr* their *endeavours* ought to proceed, before a *period* may *justly* be put to them, so as that a rational full assurance may be had, that the *Council* has perform'd the *Conditions* requir'd on it's part in order to the *sending* of the *Holy Ghost*; which when I see a *satisfactory* account given how it is to be done, I shall think I have cause to alter my thoughts from what at present they are.

But I meet with a late *Controversist* of the *Romish* Party, who yeilds, that the *Definition* of a *General Council*, is not immediately inspir'd by *God*; and yet sayes, that it is *suo modo* Divine. 'Tis true indeed, that whatsoever is deriv'd by *intermediat* Causes from *God*, the same is *suo modo* Divine; but he does not hold the *Definition* of a *General Council* to be the proper result of *intermediat* Causes, though depending on the first, for *such* he judges

in;

The several ways of resolving Faith

insufficient to beget *divine certainty*, which he requires as the *only safe ground* to build *divine Faith* upon. So that unless he could make it appear how there may be a *medium* between *mediat* and *immediat*, or shew that something neither *mediatly* nor *immediatly* flows from God, and yet is an effect truly proceeding from Him, his *distinction* in the sense he uses it, will not gain any favourable acceptance with those who cannot be satisfied with words insignificant of things.

SECT. IV.

The third opinion of the *Romish Party*, That the living voice of the Church, or Oral and practical Tradition, is in Articles of Faith

Faith, perpetually the same in all Ages, more largely handled than the two former (because now most in vogue with the Learned of that profession here in England) and impartially weigh'd and considered of.

THe third sort of the Romish polemic disputants finding (I imagine) that the two former fell short of giving satisfaction to many sober judicious persons, took upon them to demonstrate, That the Doctrine of the present Roman Church, is the same in Matters of Faith; which Christ and his Apostles taught; so that these likewise, as well as the other, attribute infallibility to their Church, yet not depending on an immediat influence from Heaven, but on a series of Causes settled by the good Providence of God, which in their own nature are such, as can never

26 *The several ways of resolving Faith*
ver fail to transmit the *Doctrine* of
Salvation both *pure* and *entire* from
generation to generation while the
World lasts.

The *Causes* which effect this, they
say is *Oral Tradition*, or the *living*
voice of the *Church*, which they as-
firme to be always the *same* in every
different *Age* of the world, so that
not only *whatsoever* was deliver'd to
the *Primitive Christians* by *Christ*
and his *Apostles* as a *Point* of *Faith*
hath been perpetually handed down
from time to time, without inter-
ruption till our days, as *such*, and
will be to the worlds end; but also
that nothing under the notion of an
Article of *Faith* can ever be receiv'd
and entertain'd by the *Church*, which
is not *really* and *truly* so.

The *former* of these *Assertions*
they labour to prove from the *in-*
defectible nature of *Tradition*; the
latter from this *Maxim* held (as they
say

say) in the present Church of Rome, that the *Christian Faith* was deliver'd to her as descending without interruption from *Christ* and his *Apostles*; which *Maxime* they tell us, their Church must needs in every Age have had. For, if the *Christians* of any one Age had gone about to take it up, and tell their Posterity, That the Faith they deliver'd to them, was receiv'd by themselves from their Ancestors and Predecessors, as un-interruptedly descending from *Christ* and his *Apostles*, when they knew it was not so; the Attempt of such a grand *Imposture* would have come to nothing, since it cannot be conceiv'd, that vast multitudes of people (even setting aside the consideration of all religious Tyes) could possibly conspire together in so notorious and base a Falshood, as that would have plainly been.

To the former Assertion, *viz.*
D
That

The several ways of resolving Faith,

That whatsoever was deliver'd to the primitive Christians by Christ and his Apostles, as a Point of Faith, hath been perpetually handed down from time to time without interruption till our days as such) and it's assign'd proof, the indefectibility of Tradition, I shall say nothing here, but remit the discourse, I intend upon them, to another place ; and at present enquire, Whether the present Church of Rome does indeed depend on this Maxim, for the certainty of the purity of her Faith, That Christs Doctrine was deliver'd to her, as descending without interruption from Christ and his Apostles. For if it appear, upon trial made, she doth not ; then however indefectible Tradition be, it may notwithstanding fall out, that new Articles of Faith may be introduc'd into the Church upon some other Ground, not firm and safe, such as the

in the Roman and Reformed Churches. 13

the *Traditionists* will, I know, grant, That the *Definition* of a *General Council*, not founded on *Oral Tradition*, but on this *Presumption*, That the *Bishops* effectually proceeding to define, are immediately inspir'd from *Heaven*, is: And that the *Roman Church* does not rely on the mentioned *Maxim* for the certainty of the purity and uncorruptness of her *Faith*, I have something which seems considerable, and of moment, to alledge in proof:

It will not, I presume, be deny'd, That *Cardinal Bellarmine*, and the learned *Romish Controvertists*; more generally taken notice of after him, ever since the *Reformation*. till *Rusworths Dialogues* came to light, (for all that they made it their business to resolve *Faith*, according to the *Sentences* and *practice* of their *Church*) did not conclude and aver *Tradition* to be the *alone safe Means* of con-

5 The several ways of resolving Faith
veying *Christs Doctrine* to the know-
ledge of succeeding Ages. And if
such great Lights among the *Roman*
Clergy, mistook the *Rule of Faith*,
how can we reasonably think, that
the inferiour Pastors and Laics in
their time, knew it aright? And if
they knew it not, neither could they
rely on it as *such*. For although it
were granted (which some say) that
Bellarmin himself, and all the learned
Clerks of the *Roman Church*, no
less then the other *Clergy* and *Lay-*
men, did practically rely on *Tradi-*
tion, in as much as they were *Orally*
taught their *Religion* by the pre-
ceding Generation; and that again
by the next before it, and so still
backwards, one Age of another, ever
since the very first beginning of
Christianity; yet unless they also
knowingly did it, when once they
came to make enquiry upon what
stedfast Ground the *Christian Faith*
was

was to be embrac'd, they would no longer rest upon the *instructions* they had when they *first* in their younger years believ'd, if so be upon search made, they conceiv'd (as it seems the chiefest of them, besides many more, if not the generality, did) that the *certainty* of *Faith* was not founded on *Oral Tradition*, their first *Instructor* in it, but on something els. Yea, I think, I shall not mistake the truth, if, I say, that it was not the *private* opinion of some great *Doctors*, and their *followers* only ; but the sense of the *Council of Trent* it self also ; That *Faith* is not resolv'd into *Tradition* as it's *adequate Rule* ; whilst in consulting the first *Decree* of the fourth *Session* of that *Council*, I find two *Passages*, which seem to make it out : The former of them is this, *Sacrosancta Oecumenica, & Generalis Tridentina Synodus, &c. perspicuens hanc* (nempe

D 3

Christi

21 The several ways of resolving Faith

Christianam) veritatem & Disciplinam, contineri in Libris scriptis, & sine Scripto Traditionibus, quæ ex ipsius Christi ore ab Apostolis accepta, aut ab ipsis Apostolis Spiritu Sancto dictante, quasi per manus tradita, ad nos usque pervenerunt, Orthodoxorum Patrum exempla secuta, omnes Libros tam veteris quàm novi Testamenti, cum utriusque Deus sit Author, necnon Traditiones ipsas tum ad Fidem, tum ad Mores pertinentes, tanquam vel ore tenus à Christo, vel à Spiritu Sancto dictatas, & continuâ successione in Ecclesia Catholica conservatas pari pietatis affectu, ac reverentiâ suscipit, ac veneratur.

The latter Passage closeth up the Decree thus ; Si quis Libros ipsos integros (Scripturæ scilicet) cum omnibus suis partibus, prout in Ecclesia Catholica legi consueverunt, & in veteri vulgata Latina Editione habentur, pro Sacris & Canonicis non susceperit,

seperit, & Traditiones prædictas sciens & prudens contempserit, anathema sit. Omnes itaque intelligant quo ordine, & via ipsa Synodus, post jactum Fidei Fundamentum sit progressura, & quibus potissimum Testimoniis, at Præsidis in confirmandis Dogmatibus, & instaurandis in Ecclesia Moribus sit usura. In both these Passages, *Scripture* and *Apostolical Traditions* are plainly contradistinguished, as equally relating some way or other to *Christian Faith* and *Manners*. And although in the former place, they seem to be principally oppos'd, as the *Written*, and *unwritten Word* of God; yet not without this apparent intimation also, that as the *Books*, or *written Words* call'd *Scripture*, leade to the sense or *Doctrine* contain'd in them; so likewise the *unwritten words* where-in *Apostolical Traditions* are taught, guide to the meaning couch'd in

them ; so that as *Scripture* and *Traditions* taken in the former sense, are held by the *Council* to be equally the *Word of God* ; so are they moreover in the latter sense held to be equally significative and expressive of the *Doctrine of Salvation* delivered by them. But in the latter rehearsed place of the *Decree*, *Scripture* and *Traditions* are chiefly to be understood of written and unwritten words directing to the knowledge of the *Objects of Faith* ; as appears by these Lines here following transcrib'd from thence : *Quibus potissimum Testimoniis, & Praesidiis (nemque Scriptura & Traditionibus) in confirmandis Dogmatibus, & instaurandis in Ecclesia Moribus, sit usura Synodus.* For *Scripture* and *Traditions*, cannot here be taken for *Christs Doctrine* it self, but for *Characters* and *Sounds*, apt to discover what is meant by them. From the whole, these-

therefore I gather, That the Council of Trent, resolves *Faith* into *Scripture* and *Traditions*, when taken for the *Word* of *God*, or *Doctrine* of *Salvation*, as into it's proper *Object*; and into the same *Scripture* and *Traditions*, when taken, the one for a *Testimony* in *Writing*, the other for an *Oral Testimony*, as into it's *adequat Rule*; saving what the Adverb *potissimum*, in the last recited Passage of the Council may peradventure abate,

In hopes to enervate the force of this Discourse, 'twill not improbably, be said, That *Scripture* and *Apostolical Traditions*, are granted to be held by the *Tridentin Council*, the *Totum* or *Extent* of all *reveal'd Truths*; and consequently, the *Characters* and *Sounds*, or the *written* and *unwritten* words, wherein they are contain'd, the *material Rule* of *Faith*; but seeing it is

Oral

Oral Tradition that informs us of the sense of both, this alone is the formal Rule of Faith, and that even according to the mind of the *Trent Fathers* themselves; as the subsequent Passage of the second Decree of the fourth Session, testifieth; *Adversanda petulantia ingenia decernit* (eadem scilicet *Sacrofancta Synodus*) *ut nemo sue prudentie innixus in rebus Fidei, & Morum ad adificationem Doctrinae Christianae pertinentiam, Sacram Scripturam, ad suos sensus contorquens, contra eum sensum quem tenuit ac tenet Sancta Mater Ecclesia, ejus est judicare de vero sensu & interpretatione Scripturarum sanctarum, aut etiam contra sensum unanimum Patrum ipsam Scripturam sacram interpretari audeat.*

In return to this, I shall not deny, but that if *Holy Scripture* were *Writ*, and *Apostolical Traditions* express'd in Words, not plainly significative

ficative of *one determinate sense*, but had their *intelligibleness* in *Matters of Faith and Manners* from *Oral Tradition*, this *alone* would be the *formal Rule of Faith*. But then, in case the thing were truly so, and the late quoted place of the *Council* intended as much ; I see not how that learned *Assembly* can be clear'd from contradicting it self ; since *Scripture*, and *Apostolical Traditions*, if meer *unintelligible Characters* and *Sounds*, without their suppos'd authentick Interpreter *Oral Tradition*, would be so far from being *two Witnesses*, or *Testimonies* of *Christs Doctrine*, (which yet, as was seen, the *Council* solemnly, and not transiently, calls them) that they would neither of them be any *Witness* or *Testimony* thereof at all ; the very nature and office of a *Witness* or *Testimony* being this, to manifest, and render intelligible to those who are

im-

18 *The several ways of resolving Faith.*

immediatly, concern'd to understand it, what it bears *witness* or gives *testimony* unto ; *immediatly* I say, concern'd ; but *who* those are, in respect of the *Rule of Christian Faith*, I defer the enquiry of to another place. At present, in regard it will not, I presume, be admitted that the *Council* contradicts it self, the sense of the rehearsed *Passage* is far more obvious, then that which hath been mention'd, if not evident, to be this ; That whatsoever the *Holy Scripture* is through either weakness or wilfulness drawn to a *wrong sense*, it of *Right* belongs to the *Governors* of the *Church* to declare the *true sense* thereof ; which the *Council* might very well think to be just and fitting without supposing the words of *Scripture* to be *unsens'd* Characters, since experience daily shews, that things *easy* to be understood, are often *mis-*
taken

staken by the *vulgar*, and very plain words and sentences, wrested by men of subtil wits, to a *perverse sense*.

Two Witnesses then of Christs Doctrine, viz. *Scripture* and *Traditions*, the Council of Trent still seems to me plainly to assert. But besides these, let's consider if there was not moreover a *third*, which the *Prelats* had an eye to, in respect of something *desin'd* by them; for I cannot conjecture, what they should mean by the Word *potissimum*, mentioned before, except this, That there are some *divine Truths*, which are not so clearly contain'd, either in *Scripture*, or *Apostolical Traditions*, as to be sufficiently attested by them, and that therefore, they stood need of a further *Testimony*, to make them *manifest*; which whether it was the *unanimous* consent of the *Fathers*, or the *immediat assistance* of the *Holy Spirit*, or something

thing els which the *Council* intended, I have no need to be scrupulous about, since my business in this place, was no more but to discover, Whether the *Church of Rome* (as 'tis affirm'd by the *Traditionists*) do really rely on this *Maxim* for her *Faith*, that it was recommended to her as *Orally descending by a continued succession, from Christ and his Apostles* ; or that it is but a thing speciously pretended, on her behalf, to avouch her *Doctrine* by ; wherein, as the preceding Discourse hath already shewn in general, so the subsequent will hereafter shew in particular, what the truth to my apprehension is ; whilst that which has been said, concerning the *Council of Trent's* opinion in the Point, shall be further seconded and confirm'd by several *Instances* out of the same.

The first shall be, That it has defin'd *Sess. 4 Decret. 1. What Books are*

are Canonical ~~Scripture~~ ^{Scripture}, and anathematizes those who will not receive them as such, amongst which the *Epistle to the Hebrews* is one; and yet it has not always been esteem'd Canonical by the *Western Church*, as is granted by *Cardinal Perron*, and others of the *Romish Profession*, that *St. Ferom*, whose testimony cannot be in reason refus'd, affirms; for being in his time an eminent Member of the same Church, he could not be ignorant of her practice, and that he would Write an *anathema*, whereof he might easily be detected, is not at all credible.

The Second Instance is, That the *Books Apocryphal*, for which there is no *Universal Tradition*, that they are the Word of God, as *Dr. Cosins* (late Lord Bishop of Durham, in his *Scholastical History of the Canon of Scripture* shews, are defin'd by the Council of *Trent Sess. 4. Decree 1.* to be Canonical Scripture.

The

The several ways of resolving Faith

The *third* (and last Instance, which at present I shall produce) is to be seen, *Sess. 7. Can. 9. of the Trent Synod*, where we find it thus defining; *Si quis dixerit in tribus Sacramentis Baptismo scil. Confirmatione, & Ordine, non imprimi Characterem in anima, hoc est signum quoddam spirituale & indelebile, unde ea iterari non possunt, Anathema sit.* These according to the *Traditionists* are the words, or at least, the sense of the words of the Church diffusive pronounc'd by it's Representative; by which it seems there is a Tradition, that a Character or a certain Spiritual indeleble signe is imprinted in the Souls of those who are baptiz'd, confirm'd and ordain'd. Now That the generality of *Pastors, Parents, Tutors, and Nurses* (the sure Conveyers of Christianity, as the *Traditionists* tell us, from Age to Age) should know what it is to have a Character or Spiritual signe imprinted

in

in the Soul and without that they could not declare it in various forms of speech, as was requisite they should, in regard, that one main reason given by the *Traditionists*, why *Christs Doctrine* cannot fail in the conveyance, is, because it is express'd so many several ways, that the generality of the Hearers, cannot chuse but understand it aright) I see small cause to think, especially, when I reflect, That the great Master of the *Traditionary Disciples* in his *Institut, Sacr. Tom. 2. Lict. 4.* thus teacheth; *Ponere signa spiritualia, i. e. invisibilia contra ipsam rationem si ni est, quod pro materiali oportet esse notum & visibile, pro eo vero quod significat latens, unde non nisi inter homines, qui colligunt scientiam ex objectis, reperuntur, & non possunt esse spiritalia, sed ex necessitate sensibilia.* And in the page following, the same terms

24 *The several ways of resolving Faith*

ed *Author* asserteth ; *Ipsam personam esse subjectum Characteris, cum actio sit communis corpori, & anima, i. e. totius.* If perchance it should be said, That the scope of the Canon is only to declare, that there is an appropriation, or appointment of a mans whole life, to some solemn Engagement or Action ; as by Baptism to be a Christian ; by Confirmation to undergoe courageously the Christian warfare ; by Order to Preach the Word, to administer the Sacraments, &c. so that not any of them is to be iterated, and this Christians generally know ; for who is ignorant, that none us'd to be Baptiz'd, none confirm'd, none ordain'd, more then once ? I reply, If the Tradition of the Church be plac'd wholly in that, then in case the Council has defin'd more, it could not ground the same upon the uninterrupted delivery thereof. And that the Council has

in the Roman and Reformed Churches. 3

has defin'd more, appears from this,
That the *Canon* further declares two
things, which whosoever denies, in-
curs an *Anathema*; the one is,
That the *Character* given in the
three nominated *Sacraments*, is a *spi-
ritual sign*; the other, That the *soul*
(*alone*) is the *subject* thereof, (for
although the word *alone* be not in
the *Canon*; yet it is necessarily im-
ply'd, because a *spiritual sign* can-
not be *imprinted* in a *corporeal sub-
stance*) and therefore, as to these,
the *Council* could not ground the *De-
finition* upon *Tradition*.

SECT. V.

*The Controversists of the Re-
formed Church, make Scripture
the Rule of Faith. Two main
different*

5 The several ways of resolving Faith

different Opinions, notwithstanding in what sense it is so, The former Assertion look'd into, and thought more plausible, then solid. A Sect which holds private illumination of the spirit a necessary Means of knowing and understanding Scripture. Another sort of people, who take the Light within them, to be their sole Guide in matters of Belief and Practice. Both their Pretensions fairly examined, and found to be delusions.

HAVING given some principal reasons, why I cannot approve of the *Romish Ways* of resolving Faith, I'll proceed to enquire into the Assertions of the more popularly applauded *Disputants* of the *Reformed Church* concerning it, and try what rational satisfaction can be expected from them. I'll nominate them

in the Roman and Reformed Churches. 37

them both (for they are two) in this place, but shall refer the consideration of the *latter* to the following *Section*; and treat here at present of the *former* only, which is this;

The sacred Scripture is clear in all things necessary to salvation, to as many as have their Understandings illuminated by the holy Spirit.

The *other* Assertion (which shall be handled afterwards) is rendered thus;

All things necessary to salvation, are clear in scripture to every Understanding.

According to both these,

*The Holy Scripture (but in a different way) is
The Rule of Faith.*

Those Controvertists who maintain

The several ways of resolving Faith

tain the former Assertion, admit and make use of *Tradition*, to guide them to the *Scripture*; which when they have found, they believe it to be the *Word of God*, no longer upon the account of *Tradition*, but for it's own cause. For these men, no less then the *Romanists*, requiring *infallible* certainty of *Faith*, and thinking withall that no proof is *infallible* which is not *divine*, say that *Scripture*, by it's own light, discovers it self to be the *Word of God* to every Understanding capable of discerning it, or which is *illuminated* (for that is their meaning) by the *Holy Ghost*. And to illustrate this, they compare the *Scripture* to the *Sun*; the Understanding to the *Eye*; saying, that although the *Sun* be a glorious light, sufficiently able to manifest it's own lustre, yet if the *Organ* of seeing be so out of frame that it cannot receive it's rays, till the eyesight be clear'd

clear'd, the *glory* of the *Sun* will not be discern'd. In like manner albeit the *Scripture* has *light* enough in it self to shew that it is of *Divine Authority*; yet if the *Intellect* be not in a fit disposition to perceive the radiant *brightness* thereof (which it cannot by *nature*, but by a *Supernatural* assistance only be) it will remain devoid of being *enlightened* thereby.

All this, upon first sight, is very plausible and taking; but if the Comparison be well observ'd, it comes not home to the business. For the *Eye* being naturally capable of receiving the *Sunbeams*, no more is requir'd to make it see the *Sun*, then the bare removal of such *Obstructions*, or *infirmities* (if any be) as are contracted in, or about it, and the holding it open toward the *Sun*. But if the *Holy Spirit* do no more, but free the *Understanding* from such

20 The several ways of resolving Faith
prejudices, obscurities and other in-
cumbrances as impede the use of
Right Reason, the Scripture will
never discover it self to the Intellect
by the sole perusal of it to be of
divine Revelation; no not so much
as to the most excellent Sayings, and
Sentences in it. For such Sayings,
and Sentences are either agreeable
to cleay unhys'd Reason, and when
read or heard, discernable by it to
be true, or they are not; if they are,
whatever their excellency appear to
be, 'will not necessarily shew them
to be any part of divine Revelation,
since they may be the Effects of a
rational soul, as well as the immediate
Dictate of the Holy Ghost, or other
divine Revelation, from the Father
or the Son; if they are not, they'll
be above the reach of humane nature
to comprehend; so that no man li-
ving shall with certainty be able to
affirme they are of God unless to
ascertain'd

ascertain'd to him by some *Testimony* falling within the compass of his *Understanding*, plainly shewing them to be *divine Truths*.

If with intent to avoid the force of this reasoning, or for any other cause and consideration, some perchance should say, That more is meant by *illumination* of the *Spirit*, than a bare clearing of the *Intellect* from such *incumbrances* as hinder it's due apprehension of a thing otherwise *obvious* to it, they must relinquish, and disclaim the Comparison, between the *Sun* and the *Scripture*, the *Eye* and the *Understanding*. Neither, when this is done, do I think they can intelligibly shew, what it is besides. For if they'll have it to be some *celestial inspiration*, which discovers the *light* of the *Scripture* to the *Intellect*, by imprinting a *supernatural Quality* in the *soul*, it must be suppos'd, that the

the *Scripture*, without this, is not a *light* sufficient to manifest it self, and then, the *Scripture*, and the *Illumination* of the *Spirit* must either give *mutual* witness to each other, while the *Illumination* of the *Spirit* shews the *Scripture* to be a *celestial light*; and the *Scripture* again, proves the *Illumination* of the *Spirit* to be a *divine Influence*, and no *delusion*, (which every young Schollar knows to be a fallacious way of arguing;) or els, the discovery of the *Scriptures light*, must be held wholly to depend upon the *Illumination* of the *Spirit*, without attributing any help to *Scripture*, for the manifestation of it's own *light*, or that it is the *Word of God*; which is against the *supposition*, and likewise plain *Enthusiasm*.

Now that I am naming *Enthusiasm* it will not be unreasonable to consider by the way, what the *Enthusiasts*, whom

whom I'll comprehend under two heads, hold, and what truth there is in their opinions.

The one sort acknowledges (at least in words) the *Holy Scripture* to be the *Rule of Faith*, but withall says, that no man can either know it to be *divinely inspir'd*, or what the *true* sense of it is, but by the *immediate* operation of the *Holy Ghost*, which therefore whoso hath not, he is void of *Grace*, and can never, so remaining, attain *Salvation*.

That no *Christian* can be sav'd without the *Gifts* and *Graces* of the *Spirit*, *Faith*, *Hope*, and *Charity*, is no: to be doubted of. But that the *extraordinary* Gift of discerning the *Scripture* to be the *Word* of *God*, and of interpreting it aright, is necessary to every mans *salvation*, I see not any ground for. 'Tis true we read in *Holy Writ*, that in the *Apostles* days some had the *Gift* of
in

44 *The several ways of resolving Faith.*

interpreting *Scripture*, but it was not common to all good *Christians*, and therefore others who had it not, might be saved, if their Hearts were sanctified by *Faith*, *Hope*, and *Charity*, which if those who were endued with the *Gift* of interpreting *Scripture* were destitute of, they might, yea certainly would fall short of *Bliss*, as is clear from these words of *St. Paul*, *Though I have the gift of Prophecie and understand all Mysteries, and all Knowledge, &c. and have not Charity I am nothing.* 1 *Cor.* 13. 2. No Argument then can be drawn from those inspired men to justify the Tenet of the *Enthusiasts* I am speaking of; because these make the *Gift* of interpreting *Scripture* to be necessary to *Salvation*, whereas it was in those only *Gratia gratis data*, not *Gratia gratum faciens*, as was also the *Gift* of *Healing* and of *Tongues* in some others, but long since ceased.

sed, as not being of *necessary* use to the Church beyond that Age wherein God in his *Wisdom* bestow'd them on it.

The other sort of *Enthusiasts* go further, for they have no regard to *Sacred Writ* as necessary for *direction, help, or assistance* either in their *belief* or *way of living*, but solely and wholly attend to the *Light* (as they call't) within them, for their *guidance* in both, whilst they think themselves as *inerrably* instructed by it, as *Moses*, the *Prophets*, and *Apostles* were by God.

That it is a *Delusion* these People are possess'd with, this *Observation*, as to the Resemblance of their *con-
teited* Light to that *true* one where-
with *Moses* and the *Apostles* were
enlightned, satisfies me; namely, that
these confirm'd their *Doctrin* by many
signal *Miracles*, as was altogether re-
quisite and even *necessary* they should,
be

46 *The several ways of resolving Faith*

because the *one* (to wit *Moses*) introduc'd a *Law* which *Humane wit* was not able to discern the *Good* of, in order to *Salvation*: the *other* (viz. the *Apostles*) publish'd a *Doctrin* beyond *Mans Reason* to comprehend, or to see a *necessity* of, in respect of his *eternal welfare*; and therefore there had been no cause why the *People* should have credited them, yea, they ought in reason to have despis'd them as *Impostors*, if they had not both told them that they had *Authority* for what they did *immediatly* from *God*, and likewise had prov'd the same by *immediat Testimony* (as they did) from *Heaven*. But the *Enthusiasts*, here discours'd of, do no *Miracle*, and therefore seeing they labour to set up a *new Guide* in the world, *independent* on the *Word of God*, for the governing men in the whole course of their lives, as well for *Doctrin*, as *Practice*,

*Et*ce, they ought not in reason to have any *credit* given them, for as much as *That* (whatever it be) which has not the manifest *stamp* of *Divine Authority* upon it, cannot without *injustice* exclude a *formally* establish'd *Divine Law*, and be plac'd at self in stead thereof. This was one principal cause, why our *blessed Saviour*, being about to *abrogate* the *Law* of *Moses*, and to *introduce* his own in it's room, did many great *Miracles*, to evidence that *he* was sent of *God*, as appears by these his own *sacred words*; *The works that I do, bear witness of me, that the Father hath sent me, John 5. 36.* And, *If I had not done among them the works which none other man did, they had not had sin, John 15. 24.* If it should be said, That those men who speak of the *Light within them*, do not pretend, that it is any way *repugnant* to *Gospel-light*, but indeed the

48 *The several ways of resolving Faith*

the very same ; I would gladly know, Whether their suppos'd *Light* have any dependance on the *Gospel* of *Christ*, either for it's *existence*, or *approbation* ; If they say, it has not (as they're oblig'd, I suppose, by their *Way* to do) I demand, Whether it be a *Divine*, or not a *Divine* *Light* ; if they yield, that it is no *Divine* *Light*, then certainly the *Gospel* of *Christ* being confirm'd immediately from *Heaven*, to be a *Divine* *Light* manifested to the world to shew it the *Way* to *Bliss*, ought solely to be look'd upon, and eyed as our *Guide*, appointed by *God*, to bring us to *salvation*. But if they will say, It is a *Divine* *Light*, then it must either evidence it self by it self to be so ; (which the very *Scripture*, as I have shewn, cannot do in it's own behalf) or els receive it's *approbation* and *testimony* from something that is evidently *Divine* ;
which

which besides the *Holy Scripture* attested by *Miracles* to be so, can be nothing els but *Miracles* themselves. And neither of these give witness to the pretended *Light*; not the *Scripture*, as appears both from what has been already said; and from this also, that in case the *Scripture* were not extant in the world, yet would the *Light* spoken of be held by its abettors, to have the very same *authority* and *efficacy*, it is now suppos'd to have. And as for *Miracles*, the pretence to them, if any were made, would be frivolous, since they are no more *visible*, then the *Light* which is said to be *within*, is apparent to our eyes. Thus much for the pretended resemblance between the *Light* which *Moses*, and the *Apostles* were directed by; and the *Comet* which misleads these *Enthusiasts*. And as for any likeness between the *Light* that the *Holy Pro-*

F

phets

50 *The several ways of resolving Faith,*

phets had, and which these men boast of, 'twill easily appear, there's likewise none at all, if we do but consider, that the *Prophets* stuck close to the *Law* of *Moses*; their office, being either to press the *spiritual* sense, and intent of it to the People, who too generally thought the *external* observance of it, was all that *God* requir'd at their hands; or els to foretel future *Judgements* and *Mercies*, and that with respect particularly had to the *breach* or *keeping* of the *Law*, save only in the case of the *Messias*, which was of general Concern, as respecting the benefit of *Mankind*. But as for the *Rule* of their *life* and *conversation*, whether in regard of *Doctrine* or *Manners*, they held none but the known *Jewish Law*, together with the rest of the *Nation*.

SECT.

SECT. VI.

*The latter Assertion, concerning
The Rule of Faith, wherein it
is held by some of the Refor-
mation to consist; with reflecti-
ons made about the verity of
the Assertion.*

HAVING by way of digression cast
mine eye upon the weak Con-
ceptions of the *Enthusiasts*, and dis-
cover'd them to be vain and frivo-
lous Opinions, I return to my more
serious and intended course, to make
enquiry, what truth the *Assertion* of
the latter mention'd sort of *Contro-
vertists*, belonging to the *Reformation*,
has in it, viz.

52 *The several ways of resolving Faith*

*All things necessary to Salvation
are clear in Scripture to
every Understanding.*

What the *Patrons* of this Opinion here call *Things necessary to Salvation*, they otherwhile nominate *Fundamental Points*, that is, *Divine Truthes*, the *explicit* knowledge whereof is necessary to every mans *Salvation*, whence they're said to be necessary, *necessitate medii*, whereas other *Scriptural Truths*, are not held to be necessary, save only *necessitate precepti*. To make their Assertion therefore good, 'twill be requisit for them to prove, that all *fundamental Points*, may clearly be known by *Scripture alone* of every man, which how they'd ever be able to do, I cannot in the least apprehend. For clearly to know a thing, is to have an *explicit* knowledge of it; since then there are but *two* possible means

(I think) of coming in a rational way to the *explicit* knowledge of *Fundamental Truths* by *Scripture alone* (so as that a *firm* assurance may be had thereof, and without *such* assurance, 'twill be by meer chance, if *Fundamentals* be *explicitly known*; and consequently, the attaining *Salvation* will be an *uncertain* and *hazardous* thing, even then, when the *best Means* are us'd for the same) viz. either by gathering from it, that *such* and *such* Truths contain'd therein, are all of them *fundamental* ones, and none besides; or els, by gaining an *explicit* knowledge of all *Doctrinal Truths* in it *whatsoever*, or, at least, in that *part* or *parts* of it, which comprehend all *fundamental Points*; if neither of these two ways of coming to the *explicit* knowledge of all *fundamentals* be practicable by *every man*, then, I doubt, 'twill be a *Task* too difficult

ever to be clearly made out, That *All things necessary to salvation, are clear in Scripture to every Understanding.* And that neither of the mentioned ways are practicable by every one, seems evident. For that *all fundamentals cannot by the sole Means of Scripture be known distinctly and apart from every other Scriptural Doctrine,* is the acknowledgment of the *Proposers and Defenders* of the Assertion Treated of. And that *all Doctrinal Truths contain'd in the whole Scripture, or in a considerable Part of it, cannot be explicitly known by every man,* needs no further confirmation (I should think) then barely to reflect, how far it is from all probability, that *all Mechanicks, Labourers, Servants, and multitudes* beside, that make up the *Mass* of mankind, or even perhaps any *one* of them should be able to get an *explicit* knowledge of

of all doctrinal Verities in Holy Writ, or in a considerable Part of it. Neither, some perhaps would here reply, is necessary; for in whatsoever Book or Books of Scripture it can be certainly known, that all *Fundamentals* are clearly contain'd, the summe of all the Doctrines therein, need only be explicitly known, and not of the whole Bible, or a great Part of it. 'Tis very right; but I can by no means understand what way we can be ascertain'd, That all *Fundamentals* are clearly contain'd in any one Book of Scripture, or in fewer at least, than in so many of the whole Canon of the New Testament, as have been always held of unquestionable Divine Authority in the Catholick Church. For that all *Fundamentals* are not clearly contain'd in any one Book of Scripture, I have this to say, because, If it were otherwise, they

36 *The several ways of resolving Fairly*

would most probably be in one of the four *Gospels*; take then *Saint Luke*, which is the fullest of them all, yea, supply out of the rest, if there be any conceiv'd necessary Truth wanting in his, which is in theirs; and yet, we shall find no clear mention made of *salvation* to be had by *Christ*, without the observance of the *Mosaicall Law*; for seeing it was given by *God*, and never declar'd abrogated by our Blessed *Saviours* either *Preaching*, or *example*, but both ways confirm'd, there can be nothing spoken of *Faith in Christ* in any of the *Gospels*, which is of force enough to prove, That those who imbrac'd *Christs Doctrine*, were not still oblig'd to keep *Moses* his *Law*. Yea, the practice of *Saint Peter* (till the vision of the four-footed Beasts of the earth, and wild Beasts, and Creeping things, and Fowles of the ayre descending from Heaven,

Heaven, Acts 10.) and of the whole Church also sufficiently witness, that without a further *Revelation* then any manifest in our *Saviours* time, the observation of *Moses Law* should have always continued, and been held not only *lawful* to be us'd, but of the same *necessity* to be kept, which it had ever been by the *Jews*. So that the whole thing here remaining to be satisfied in, is, whether or no, it be a *Fundamental Point* of *Christian Doctrine*. That *Jesus Christ*, without the observance of the *Judaical Law*, comprehending it's Rites and Ceremonies, is sufficient for *salvation*. Hence then it appearing evident, That all *Fundamentals* are not clearly contain'd in any one, or in all the *Gospels*, I see not how any fewer (at least) then those Books of the *New Testament*, whose *Divine Authority* have been ever current in the Church, can reasonably

bly be thought (since all *Fundamentals* are not definitely known, and so cannot be pointed out *where* they be) to comprehend all *Fundamental Truths*. And even those Books contain *Doctrines* so many, so dispers'd, and so variously phas'd, that certainly, no considerat knowing person could once entertain a serious thought, that the *generality* of *Mankind*, or even of *Christians*, is capable of explicitly knowing them all.

Nor is it, what I have hitherto said, the whole scruple I have about this Opinion, That *all things necessary to salvation, are clear in Scripture to every understanding*; For if it were indeed a true Assertion, then would *Scripture* be the *Rule of Faith*, immediately (or without the *Churches sense* upon it) to every one, and consequently; no man could of right be *excommunicated* (or excluded from partaking of *Christian* Ord-

Ordinances and Priviledges) for holding and maintaining any *Error*, though opposit to an *Article* of *Catholick* and *Apostolick Faith*, if so be he were fully perswaded in his own thought, that it was a *Truth* to be plainly found in *Scripture*; whilst none ought to be blam'd, censur'd, or any ways molested (some of which certainly, he that is *excommunicated*, falls under) for following the *Rule of Faith*, which yet (supposing the *Scripture* to be *immediatly* so to every man) every one doth, who is fully possess'd in his own mind, that his Opinion however *dangerous* in it self, is rightly groundd on *Holy Writ*. Yea, (if it were truely so That *Scripture* is the *Rule of Faith* in manner aforesaid) though a man should for some sinister end broach an *Error*, contrary to an *Article of Faith*, yet if he stood constantly to't, that it
was

60 *The several ways of resolving Faith*

was his real Opinion and belief that the same was a *Divine Truth* plainly set forth in *Scripture* (no reasonable proof being able to be made out that he profess'd otherwise than he thought) no *excommunication* could in that case legally be pronounc'd against him; because, that as to outward appearance, he followed the *Rule of Faith*, which the *Church* can only take cognizance of; *Ecclesia non judicat, nisi de externis.*

Some peradventure would not stick to interpose, and be so unreasonable as to ask me, what harm would accrew if there were no *Excommunication*, or *Church Discipline* at all, exercis'd in respect of mens opinions in Points of *Doctrin*? To such a foolish demand, I should return in answer, that since the *Christian Religion*, was instituted by God to be a *Way* or *Method* for bringing men to *Felicity*, and that the same undoubtedly consists of certain *Doctrins*

as

as well as *Manners*, t'is in effect to call into question the *Wisdom* of *God*, to suppose that any *constitutive* part of that *Religion* may be either alter'd or omitted without endangering *Salvation*, the end whereunto it was design'd. This allow'd to be so, 'twill follow, that all who desire to become *Christians*, must resolve to embrace those *Doctrins*, and live according to those *Manners*, that the *Christian Religion* maintains. Which *Doctrins* and *Manners* (or necessary Means of Salvation) since they are not (as has been shewn) so *distinctly* and *signally* propounded in *Scripture*, as that every one who is concern'd to know them, can rationally be assur'd of himself, *which* they be, 'twas necessary from the beginning, is now, and ever will be, that some select known Persons should be appointed to declare the *Contents* of the *Christian Religion*, or the *Terms* and *Conditions*

62 *The several ways of resolving Faith*

Conditions upon which an *Admission* into *Christian Fellowship*, or the *Church*, is to be granted to every particular person, and the *Terms* and *Conditions* appearing to them to be perform'd actually, either to *admit* them themselves, or to constitute and appoint others to *do* it. If it were not always thus, every one that pleas'd might, at any time, justly joyn himself to the *Christian Society*, without performing any other *Conditions*, then he in his *own* Judgement thought requisite to capacitate him to be a *Member* of the *Church*; nor could he, without injury done unto him, be debarr'd of *Christian Communion*; the Consequence of which, must be granted to reach to this, That all the *Hereticks* who ever made profession of *Christianity*, and judg'd themselves fit to be of the *Christian Society*, and yet were excluded by the *Church* from her *holy Communion*,
were

were injuriously dealt with, which if for certain they were, *one Faith, one Baptism* would consist together with *all Heresies, no Disciplin*. Some then there always were, and still must be, to declare the *Terms* and *Conditions* of *Christian Community*; and 'tis equally reasonable and requisite, there should likewise perpetually be *some* entrusted to declare when the same *Terms* and *Conditions* be, after *admission* into the *Church*, notoriously violated; and upon such violation to debar the offender by a just *Sentence*, from participating with the *Society* in their *Christian Privileges*; for otherwise, any one might violate the *Laws* of *Christianity*, when and how he pleas'd, and yet nevertheless, should still have the same *legal Right* to enjoy at his pleasure the *Privileges* thereof, as if he had not broken them at all, since no man ought to be depriv'd of the *Privileges*

64 *The several ways of resolving Faith*

ledges of the Society, whereof he is constituted a *Member*, till it be solemnly declar'd, he has rendred himself incapable of the same.

Besides the *Reasons* given, I have another strong inducement to make me think, That *All things necessary to Salvation are not clear in Scripture to every Understanding*, to wit, The fifth Chapter of the first Part of the Epilogue to the Tragedie of the Church of England, written by the learned and ingenuous Mr. Herbert Thorn-dike. But I lately met with an ingenious Piece, which attempts the confutation of this Chapter, and yet after *satis eloquentia*, concludes thus, *Qui Deum votis sollicitat, ut librum aperire dignetur, circumstantias cujusque loci animo revolvit, obscuriora confert cum apertioribus, in veritatem primæ magnitudinis oculorum defigit aciem, constanter repudiat quicquid post diligentissimum scrutinium adver-*
sum

sum videatur, a vide complectitur quod non invitis consequentis inde elicitur, intervallum temporis et in mora non erit, quod minus intellectu consequatur, quicquid insolubili vinculo salutis annectitur. Granting all this to be a great truth, is it no more then a feasible Task for the generality of men and women, to weigh duly the Circumstances of every place of *Scripture*? to compare well the obscure places of it, with those which are plain, to distinguish aright of the more or less material Truths, to observe diligently what's opposit to the principal Doctrins, and to draw true Inferences from plain Texts? When I see cause to believe that every Plowman, Artificer, Labourer, Servant, with many other such like, (not to name people of better education) can perform all this, I shall think the *fifth Chapter to the first Part of the Epilogue to the Church*

Q

of.

66 *The several ways of resolving Faith*

of England, possible to be confuted. In the interim, I wonder how oft it were convenient to read, or hear the *Scripture* read over, before an ordinary Layman could in prudence begin to consider of the Circumstances of every place of it, and how long after he would be in weighing them well; What time, I muse, would be allow'd him wherein to mark what is obscure, what plain; What sure way not to be deceiv'd, would he, I admire, take to hit aright of the most important Truths; And whence should we think him competently enough skill'd to draw right Consequences from evident Truths? If he could and should at length do whatsoever is prescrib'd, for understanding the necessities to Salvation; what Religion in the mean time, I would gladly understand would the poor *Seeker* be of? If the first Publisher of this opinion amongst us, that *All things necessary*

salvation, are clear in Scripture to every Understanding, had foreseen the lamentable use which was of late, and still is made of it, he would, I believe, have been more cautious, then when he had with great industry and learning, confuted the *Papal Infallibility*, to have propos'd a way for setting up a *Pope* in every private mans brest, as by the mentioned *Affertion*, he has done; whilst every one is certainly *infallible* in that wherein he cannot, unless he will himself, be deceived; and such is each one in the necessary *Points of Religion*, to whom the *Scripture* is clear in all things necessary to salvation, seeing he may clearly in those, if he please, understand the *Scripture*, which being *infallible*, will make him *infallible* also, so farr as he rightly understands it.

S E C T. VII.

Whether the Rule of Faith affords Infallible, or but Moral certitude of Christs Doctrine? Whether we may not now, in our days, have as great certainty thereof, as the Disciples of the Apostles had? And whether the like certainty which they had, be not enough for the Church of the present and future Ages.

ALthough I have hitherto made no discovery wherein the *Rule of Faith* seems rightly to be placed; yet have I in prospect something (I hope) tending to my satisfaction in the search thereof. But before I set my self to manifest what it is, I'll
first

first endeavour so farr as I am able to understand, what certainty the *Rule of Faith* affords, whether *infallible*, or such only as excludes *actual doubting*. Those who assert the former, say, That *Christs Doctrine* is, and ought to be *infallibly* certain to us ; they who affirm the latter, say, That it is only *morally* certain, (and that's sufficient) *quoad nos*. Neither of these, in my opinion, if candidly interpreted, speak amiss. For the asserters of it's *moral* certitude only, do not (I conceive) think it *uncertain*, in any degree whatsoever, but would be ready to explode any such speech as this, 'tis ten thousand, or an hundred thousand to one, but no more ; that this, which we call, the *Christian Faith*, is the very *Doctrine* of *Salvation* which *Christ* and his *Apostles* taught ; for they steadfastly averr, (if I strangely misunderstand them

G 3

not)

10 *The several ways of resolving Faith*

not) an *absolute* certainty, but not by an *infallible* way, whilst to be *infallibly* certain of a thing, is to be under an *impossibility* to be deceiv'd about it; and whatever is *Impossible* implies a *Contradiction* to the *reality* of it; but it implies no *Contradiction* that mens *Senses* and *Understandings* (by which they come to the knowledge of *Christs Doctrine*, if ever) at least consider'd in themselves, should judge amiss and deceive them. And therefore although *certainty* excludes all *possibility* of mistake so far as we are really certain of a thing; yet it implies no *Contradiction* that we should think we are certain, when indeed we are mistaken, because mens *Senses* may possibly delude them; neither is the *Intellect* necessarily void of *Error* in it's *judgments*, but is capable as well of *Falshood* as of *Truth*. This notwithstanding, when a man exercises those

those *Faculties* that God has given him upon a due Object, in right Circumstances, and acts according to the utmost power of those *Faculties* rightly qualified, it implies a *Contradiction* (yet not immediat but by consequence) that so doing he should be deceived; forasmuch as it would call into question either the *Wisdom*, or the *Power*, or the *Goodness* of God, to bestow a *Faculty* to do a thing with, if the same being in right plight, and duly exercis'd on a fit Object, in convenient Circumstances, should not perform what it was given for. To instance, if mens *eyes* and *eares* rightly dispos'd for *seeing* and *hearing*, should not truely distinguish colour from colour, and sound from sound, the Objects being plac'd at a fit distance, and in a proper medium, wou'd it not imply that the *Maker* of them was some way *deficient*? The like may as truly be said of the

Intellect, or of any other *Facultie* in Man, so that the *Rule of Faith*, or that *Means* which conveys *Christs Doctrine* to Mans knowledge, if instituted (as all agree it is) by *God*, must needs give *infallible* assurance thereof, so ~~as~~ often as nothing is lacking on Mans part, to frustrate the same. And therefore from what I gather from the whole, I am satisfied that the Dispute about the *Infallibility* of the *Rule of Faith*, is more speculative and quaint, then usefull and necessary.

Wherefore, seeing no further cause of scruple about this matter, I'll be making forward to enquire, *wherein* the *Rule of Faith* doth consist, And as to this, in general I am thus far assur'd, That the right decision of the *Question*, lies wholly between the *Scripturists*, and *Traditionists*. For as for those persons who require an immediat assistance of the *Holy Spirit*

Spirit to ascertain the *Truth* of *Christs Doctrine*, their request is unreasonable ; whilst, if it were necessary to be granted, God would be oblig'd to continue a *miraculous* way of instructing in the *Faith* to the worlds end ; (for what ~~is~~ is a *Miracle*, but an effect proceeding immediately from God, without any dependence on *intermediat* Causes for it's existence, such as the *certainty* of *Christs Doctrine* would be, if grounded either on *Popes* being *inspir'd*, or *General Councils*, or *privat. Persons*) and to be necessitated to *extraordinary* ways, when *ordinary* means would serve. For if we reflect on the *Means* by which the *Disciples* of the *Apostles* came to the knowledge of *Christs Doctrine*, we are straitway assur'd, it was by *hearing*, *Rom. 10. 17*, a common and usual, not an *extraordinary* and *miraculous* way of learning *Truth*. If
then

74 *The several ways of resolving Faith*

then the *Scholars* of the *Apostles* had *sufficient* certainty of their *Faith*, and that as *great* certainty is brought down to us, as they had, we should be very unreasonable to require more. To know whether indeed we have, or no, is to be resolv'd by knowing this; Whether the *Means* by which *Christs Doctrine* is convey'd to us, be as *safe* and *sure* to trust to for us, as their *Ears* were to them; (for what matters it as to the certainty of a thing, whether it be transmitted through *one* only *medium*, or *thousands*, if they be all of *equal* merit to give credit to:) the endeavour after satisfaction in which *Doubt*, shall be the subject of my next *enquiry*; the difficulty of resolving of which, will lye in the clearing of these two Points. First, Whether a *Matter of Fact* (such as the *Preaching* of the *Gospel* is) may be as *certainly* transmitted from *one*

Gene-

Generation to another, as from the Mouth of one man to another mans Ears? Secondly, In case it may, whether the *Christian Religion* has been actually so transmitted or no?

As to the clearing of the former Doubt, it depends upon the resolving of this, Whether a Thing, which is once deliver'd and receiv'd, may be so again over and over *Perpetually*? For if it may (and what question is there to be made of it's truth, competent means being had for doing it with?) then may a *Matter of Fact* be as certainly transmitted from one Generation to another, as from the Mouth of one Man to another Mans Ears.

But whether the *Christian Faith* has been always faithfully transmitted from Age to Age, is harder to resolve; and yet seeing it was a thing feizable, 'twill be satisfaction enough

76 *The several ways of resolving Faith*

to me (without tracing the successive handing it down from time to time) that it was really done, if the *Motives* for doing it be found to be such as would *actually* incline men to the *effectual* preformance of it, as to me, it seems plain they will, for being the very *greatest* and *strongest* in them selves imaginable, viz. the *Hopes* and *Fears* of everlasting *Bliss* and *Misery*, how could they chuse but work *more* powerfully on so many mens minds as should duly weigh their *merit*, then *Motives* of *lesser* Consequence would do? and yet we see what variety of things of *ancient* time has been so *securely* brought down to *our* days, that we scruple not at all their *truths*, notwithstanding that the *Motives* for their continued conveyance were incomparably *inferior* to those, which *Christs Doctrine* has ever had for the assured *faithfull* transmitting
it

it to the present Age.

But against this conceiv'd force of the *Hopes* and *Fears* of endless *Bliss* and *Misery*, I find it smartly thus urg'd, *What a wild supposition is this, That Moral Motives and Arguments, working on a free Principle, the Will of Man do necessarily produce their effect? Is it necessary, that the Hopes of Heaven, and the Fears of Hell, should keep Christians constant to the Doctrine of Christ? And is it not as necessary, that these Arguments should prevail upon them to the practice of it? It is in vain to go about to demonstrate, That all men must be good who have sufficient Arguments propounded to them, when experience tells us the contrary. Nay, it is in reason impossible, that Moral Arguments should be of a necessary and infallible efficacy, because they are always propounded to a free Agent, who may choose*

78 The several ways of resolving Falch

choose whether he will yield to them, or not. Indeed, it is always reasonable men should yield to them, and if they be reasonable, they will; but so long as they are free, it can never be infallibly certain they will. And if men be not free, it is no vertue at all in them to be wrought upon by these Arguments. For what vertue can it be in any man, to entertain the Christian Doctrine, and adhere to it accordingly, if he do all this necessarily, that is, whether he will, or no.

The prevalent force of this arguing against what it was primarily writ, I dispute not; but so far as it seems to make against what I have asserted of the operative vertue of the *Hopes* and *Fears* of *Bliss* and *Misery*, upon the minds of those who thoroughly ponder the weighty Concern of eternal Pain and Joy; it's whole strength (I conceive) is founded

ded on the three following *Suppositions*, which are not (in my apprehension) sufficient supports for the Structure built upon them.

The *first* Supposition is this, That if *Moral Motives* produce a certain and constant Effect, the same is a necessary Effect, and destroys the Liberty of the Will. The *second* is, That the Freedom of Mans Will, consists in being at full liberty, or in an indifferency actually to refuse or accept what is propounded to it, let the *Motives, Circumstances* and frame of *Mind* at the time of the proposal be what they will. The *third* supposition is, That the same Motives must have the same operation and efficacy on mens Minds, as well to the sincere practice, as constant belief of *Christs Doctrine*. Now if none of these *Suppositions* be a sufficient firm foundation for the Arguments rais'd upon them, the whole

whole *Fabrick*, will come to ruine in their dissolution. And that none of them has solidity enough for a good foundation of what is laid thereon, I am apt for the Reasons hereafter given, to think.

For, that the supposal of *certain* and *constant* Effects proceeding from *Moral Motives* would include the destruction of the *Liberty* of the *Will*, I cannot therefore believe, because plowing and sowing, planting of vineyards, merchandizing, the study of all Arts and Sciences, the making of Laws, and even the generation of Mankind, are all of them the Effects of *Moral Inducements*, and yet not any of these shall ever fail, so long as the *Motives*, which *incline* men unto them, continue in the world. Neither will any man (I presume) say, that the *Will* is the less *free* therefore, or that men do these things whether they will or not.

The

The Issue of which will be, That either a *necessary* effect is consistent with *Freedom* of *Will*, (what ever it truly be) or els that a *certain* and *constant* effect, is not the same with a *necessary* effect, which is enough (as I suppose) to be said of the *first* Supposition.

Yea, and of the *second* also ; for if *Moral Motives* may be such, as that they'l *certainly* in some men incline the *Will*, as has been shewn by the Instances of Agriculture, Planting of Vineyards, Merchandizing, the study of Arts and Sciences, and even the propagation of Mankind in the World effected by them, they may be ; then does not the *Freedom* of the *Will* consist in this, that the *Will* is at full liberty, or in an indifferency, *actually* to refuse, or accept, what is propounded to it, let the *Motives* be never so *strong*, the *Circumstances* as cogent

2 The several ways of resolving Faith

as may be, and the *soul* in a condition as prone, as possibly to be inclin'd by them. If it were reply'd, That although *Moral Motives* may be such, as that they'l certainly, in some *Circumstances* incline the *Wills* of some men; yet, the reason of that is not, because the *Will* could not, if it would, always reject what it imbraces; but because the *Motives* are so *suitable* and *grateful* to the *present* disposition of the *Mind* that it will not refuse them, I should readily grant it; and thence withal acknowledge, that the *Will*, if it would, could undoubtedly reject any Object in any *Circumstances* whatsoever; but constant experience shews us, that it often falls out by reason of the *Motives*, the *Circumstances*, and the *present* disposition of the *Soul*, that by no means it will refuse what is offerr'd, and so, as to the certainty of the effect, do the same

same thing, as if it could not have done otherwise. For, whensoever a thing is adjudg'd the *alone* convenient, and fit *medium*, to the compassing of an *end* which is fully resolv'd on to be obtain'd, if the *Will* should reject it, 'twould in such case (which is impossible) contradict it's own nature. For example, Would it not denote a *contradictory* opposition in that mans *Will*, who, if in imminent danger to be drown'd, but desirous by all means possible to save his life, should refuse to get upon a *Plank*, when he plainly saw, and was fully satisfied, there was no other way, but by doing it, to escape immediat drowning? For, were it not in effect to be both *desirous*, and *not desirous*, to save his life in the very same moment of time? which being a thing *impossible* to be done, clearly manifests, that the very nature of the *Will* requires, that *some*

84 *The several ways of resolving Faith*

things, in *some* Circumstances be certainly embrac't by it, and consequently, that the *Freedom* of the *Will*, may consist together with the *certainty* of events, which flow from *Moral inducements*. That, this notwithstanding, and how there may be *Virtue* and *Vice*, shall be seen hereafter in the tenth *Section*.

The *third* Supposition, viz. That the *same* Motives must have the *same* operation on mens Minds, as well to the *sincere* practice, as to the *constant* belief of *Christs Doctrine*, hath no evidence of truth in it, that I can discern, since 'tis much more difficult to be prevail'd with to live a *godly life*, then to hold fast and propagate a *received Truth*; for to do this latter, no more is necessary, but to give a full *assent* thereto in our *Hearts*, and to *declare* the same by our *words* (the one of which is a thing, that the *Understanding* of necessity

cessity does, if the *Argument* or *Testimony* be convincing; the other is a matter of no difficulty at all to be perform'd) whereas 'tis necessary to the leading a *godly life* to struggle much and often with manifold strong *Tentations*, which by reason of Mⁿs *corrupted nature* frequently become his *Master*. And therefore we daily see, that multitudes of people, who from a firm perswasion that *Christs Doctrine* is the onely *Way* and *Means* to save from *Hell* and bring to *Heaven*, are very desirous and studious to have it *believ'd* and *continued* in the world, when yet they *live not* according to the *Rules* which it prescribes. But admit it were otherwise, and that none regarded the continuance of *Christs Doctrine*, but such as made it their *chief* care and business to observe it's *Precept*; yet so long as there shall be men and women that wil

86 *The several ways of resolving Faith.*

truely weigh the *merit* of the *Motives*, which perswade to the *belief* and *practice* of it, so long there shall never want those that will stedfastly adhere and keep constant to them *both*; and such there has ever been amidst the worst of Persecutions, and will be in the baddest times, maugre even all the *lying Signes* and *wonders* of *Anticrist* himself, when he shall appear in the world; and so the *Christian Religion* shall continue till the consummation of all things; and that not by virtue of any *miraculous* inspiration from *Heaven*, but by being *transmitted* from *Age* to *Age*, of the truth of both which for the reasons before shewn being well assur'd, I am got at length by several close steps to the main *Querie* of all, viz. By what *Way* or *Means* *Christs Doctrine* has been, *Successively* without *interruption* convey'd down to *our* days,

in the Roman and Reformed Churches. 87
days, and shall be so on perpetually;
while the world lasts.

SECT. VIII.

By what means the knowledge of a matter of Fact (such as the Preaching of the Gospel by Christ and his Apostles was) may be perpetuated. An examen of the force of the Romanists main Argument, whereby they endeavour to shew, That Scripture cannot be the Rule of Faith. Whether the Scripture be not as intelligible in Points of Faith, as Tradition; or the Living Voice of the Church is.

THAT a Matter of Fact (such as the Publishing of our Sa-
viours;
H 4

viours Doctrines was) can no other way become known to *future Ages*, but either by some *Writing*, or by an *Oral delivery* of it, or by both, is, beyond caviel, certain. And for as much, as no *Writing* can warrant 'its own authentickness', 'tis requisite for the due proof of the *authority* of any *Writing* of *ancient* time, that the same be ascertain'd to us by *Tradition*; so that although it were a confess'd Truth, That *Christian Doctrine* is wholly contain'd in some *one Writing* or other, yet we could have no *certainty* which is that very *Writing*, but by the *testimony* of *Tradition*. *Tradition* therefore is the *first necessary step*, at least, (if no more) which without an *immediat Revelation*, (a thing not, but through high presumption to be expected) can safely lead us to the *knowledge* of the *Christian Faith*. But whether in truth there be any *Writing* in which

which *Christs Doctrine* is so fully and clearly contain'd, that it needs no further assistance from *Tradition*, save only to attest 'its *authentickness* and *authority*, is a matter of further enquiry; For although those *Books* we call *Canonical Scripture* be sufficiently witnessed by *Tradition* to be the *Word of God*, yet if neither *Tradition* moreover say, that they are of themselves a *perfect Rule of Faith*, nor any such affirmation or equivalent to it, be expressly found in those *Books*, nor yet any evident proof from *Reason* can be made appear, that they are so; their being the *Word of God* (for so is every *Divine Sentence* in them) is not enough to entitle them to the *Rule of Faith*, or to be able to assure us *what the whole Will of God in the Gospel is*. But whether *Scripture*, *Tradition*, or *Reason*, aver so much, I'll omit the discussion of, till I have weigh'd

weighd what moment an *Argument* much insisted on to prove that *Scripture* is not the *Rule of Faith*, nor any *Part* thereof, bears. The *Argument* is this;

If *Scripture* be the *Rule of Faith* it must be in this respect, as the *Letter* of it is clearly significative of *Gods sense* in *Points of Faith* (because the thing signified by the *Letter* is the *Doctrin* of *Faith* it self, which the *Letter* as the *Rule* is to assure of) so that unless it clearly hold forth such a plain determinat *sense*, as that no other can be put upon it without manifest *injury* and *wresting*, it cannot be the *Rule of Faith*. And that it doth not hold forth such a sence, daily *Experience* shews, not only by the *different Comments* on it, but by the *dissentions* also of those who adhere to it as the *Rule of Faith*.

That the *Scripture* cannot be the
Rule

Rule of Faith, or any *Part* of it, save as the *Letter* of it is clearly significative of one determinat sense, to me, I confess, seems undeniable. But that the *Scripture* in nothing necessary to *Salvation* is so, I see no caule at all to beleieve, whilst the *Reasons* offerr'd to prove it by, are in my opinion) too weak to do it; for what matters it as to the *Scripture* being the *Rule of Faith*, how many different *Commentaries* be upon it; or what quarrelling there be about the sense of it in places not containing *Articles of Faith*? And that the *Scripture* in several grand *Articles of Faith*, yea in most, if not in all, is as clearly significative of one determinat sense, as the *Tradition* of the *Church*, (whose easiness to be understood, the *Traditionists* say qualifies it in one prime respect for the *Rule of Faith*) I thus, in a way agreeable to their own

Prin-

The several ways of resolving Faith

• *Principles* and manner of discourse, go about to make clearly evident.

The *Church diffusive* cannot immediately declare her thoughts to any one, much less to every particular either person or Congregation of people and therefore, whensoever it has been thought necessary that the same should be made known to any of her *Members* concerning a *Point of Faith*, or which was by some pretended to be so, *She* has ever us'd to employ her *Chief Pastors* (who could not be ignorant what the respective *Churches* under each ones *Charge* held in *Matters of Faith*) to impart her mind about it. And this those *Pastors* did effect, either by *Communicatory Letters*, or by meeting together, and giving their *Votes* in *Council*. Now whether of these *Ways* soever the *sense* of the *Church diffusive* was at any time made known, 'twas always done by
ex-

expressing the same in some *determinate words* committed to *Writing*. If therefore *Pastors, Parents, Guardians, Nurses, Masters of Families, (the chief Conveyers of Christian Doctrin from Age to Age)* undertake to teach any thing as the *sense* of the *Church*, they must (except they'll deceive their Hearers) do it either in the very *same words* in which the *Prelats* have caus'd it to be put in *Writing*, or in others *identified* to and with the *sense* of them. And that either *Teachers, or Learners*, can ever be certain of such *identification*, unless the *words* to which they are to be *identified* be clearly *significative of one determinat sence*, I think is impossible: If so be therefore, there be any *Article of Faith* as clearly contain'd in *Scripture*, as they are in *Communicatory Letters*, or in the *Definitions of General Councils*, the same may be as *certainly and truly learn'd*
by

4 *The several ways of resolving Faith*
by *Scripture*, as by *Tradition* or the
Living voice of the *Church*, because
there is no other way (as was shewn)
to be ascertain'd of the *Churches*
sense but by *one* of those *Means*. The
latter nam'd of which (*viz.* the *De-*
finitions of *Councils*) having obtain'd
in the *Church* to be preferr'd before
the other, 'twill suffice, by compa-
ring *Texts* of *Scripture* with *Defini-*
tions of *Councils*, to try whether *those*
be not as *clear* and *plain* to be un-
derstood, in *Points* of *Catholick* and
Apostolick Faith, as *these* are. But to
take the shortest Cut, because the
Council of *Trent* refers men wholly
to the *Creed*, call'd the *Nicene*, to
learn the *Churches sense* in those *Ar-*
ticles of *Faith* which it contains; I
will look no further into the *Coun-*
cils, but content my self with setting
down first the *Articles* of that *Creed*,
and then the *Texts* of *Scripture* over
against them, that by fairly compa-
ring

ring them together, I may satisfy my mind, whether or no the *Texts* of *Scripture* make out the *Articles* of *Faith* comprehended in the *Nicene Creed*, or any of them, as plainly as it doth; which if it be found to do, the *Objection* together with the *Reason* given, that, and why the *Scripture* cannot be the *Rule of Faith*, or any *Part* of it, will be of no validity for what they were intended.

But yet, before I compare the *Texts* of *Scriptures*, and the *Articles* of the *Creed* together; 'twill be fitting (because I said the *Council of Trent* sends us to the *Nicene Creed* to learn the *sense* of the *Church* in all those *Articles* which it contains) to transcribe the *Decree* of the third *Sess.* which is this.

Sacrosancta Oecumenica & Generalis Tridentina Synodus, &c. ante omnia statuit & decernit pramittendam esse Confessionem Fidei, Patrum

*exempla in hoc secuta, qui sacratori-
bus Conciliis hoc scutum contra omnes
haereses in principio suarum actio-
num opponere consueverunt, quo solo
aliquando, & infideles ad fidem trax-
erunt, haereticos expugnârunt & fi-
deles confirmârunt. Quare Symbolum
Fidei, quo sancta Romana Ecclesia
utitur, tanquam principium illud in
quo omnes qui fidem Christi profi-
tentur, necessario conveniunt, ac fun-
damentum firmum & unicum, contra
quod porta inferni nunquam preva-
lebunt, totidem verbis quibus in
omnibus Ecclesiis legitur, exprimen-
dum esse censuit, quod quidem ejus-
modi est.*

*Credo in unum Deum Patrem om-
nipotentem factorem Caeli & Terra,
visibilium omnium & invisibilium. Et
in unum Dominum Jesum Christum
filium Dei unigenitum, & ex Patre
natum ante omnia secula, Deum de
Deo, Lumen de Lumine, Deum ve-
rum*

rum de Deo vero ; genitum non fa-
 ctum ; consubstantialem Patri, per
 quem omnia facta sunt : Qui propter
 nos homines, & propter nostram sa-
 lutem descendit de Cælis, & incar-
 natus est de Spiritu Sancto ex Maria
 Virgine, & homo factus ; crucifixus
 etiam pro nobis sub Poncio Pilato,
 passus & sepultus est ; & resurrexit
 tertiâ dei iunctundum Scripturas, &
 ascendit in Cælum ; sedet ad dex-
 tram Patris, & iterum venturus est
 cum gloria judicare vivos & mor-
 tuos, cujus Regni non erit finis. Et
 in spiritum sanctum Dominum &
 vivificantem, qui ex Patre Filioque
 procedit ; qui cum Patre & Filio
 simul adoratur & conglorificatur, qui
 locutus est per Prophetas. Et unam
 Sanctam, Catholicam, & Apostolicam
 Ecclesiam. Confiteor unum Baptisma in
 remissionem peccatorum. Et expecto
 resurrectionem mortuorum, & vitam
 venturi seculi. Amen.

8 *The several ways of resolving Faith*

Having here set down the *Nicene Creed*, as it is in the *Trent Council*, I shall straight compare the *Texts* of *Scripture*, with the *Words*, wherein that *Creed* is express'd, in all the *Articles* of it, save only in that of the *Blessed Trinity*, which although, I make no doubt, but 'tis demonstrable by *Scripture*; yet, in regard it cannot be evidenced with that brevity which the rest may be; and that if *Scripture* be in other *Articles* as clear as the *words* of the *Creed* are, 'tis enough to overthrow the *Objection*; (whose suppos'd strength lyes in this, That it shews *Scripture* not to be plainly significative of one determinat sense in any *Article* of *Faith* whatsoever) Ple begin with this *Article* of the *Creed*; *Qui descendit de Cælis; propter nos homines, & propter nostram salutem*; and descend to the rest in their due order.

Qui

In the Roman and Reformed Churches. 99

The words of the Creed. The Texts of Scripture.

*Qui descendit de
Cælis.*

*Propter nos ho-
mines, & propter
nostram salutem.*

*Exiui à Patre
& veni in mun-
dum, iterum relin-
quo mundum &
vado ad Patrem.*

*Dicunt ei Disci-
puli ejus, ecce nunc
palam loqueris, &
Proverbium nul-
lum dicis, Joh. 16.
28. 29.*

*Factus est obtem-
perantibus sibi om-
nibus causa salutis
æterna, Heb. 5. 9.*

*Non est in aliquo
alio salus, nec enim
aliud nomen est sub
cælo datum homi-
nibus in quo o-
portet nos salvos
fieri.*

00 *The several wayes of resolving Faith*

The words of the Creed

The Texts of Scripture.

*Et incarnatus
est.*

fieri, Acts 4. ¹² 4.

Verbum caro factum est, Joh. 1. 14.

*Multi seductores
exierunt in mundum, qui non
confitentur Jesum Christum
venisse in carne, hic est seductor,
& antichristus, 2
Joh. 7.*

*De spiritu Sancto
ex Maria Virgine.*

*Cum esset desponsata
Mater ejus Maria Joseph, an-
tequam convenirent, inventa est in
utero habens de spiritu Sancto, Matth.
1. 18.*

*Dixit Maria ad
Angelum,*

The words of the Creed. The Texts of Scripture

*Angelum, quomodo
fiet istud, quoniam
virum non cognos-
co?*

*Et respondens
Angelus dixit ei,
spiritus Sanctus su-
perveniet in te, &
virtus altissimi ob-
umbrabit tibi, ideo-
que quod nascitur
ex te Sanctum, vo-
cabitur Filius Dei,
Luc. 1. 33. 34.*

Et homo factus.

*Unus Deus, unus
& Mediator Dei
& hominum, homo
Christus Jesus,
1 Tim. 2. 5.*

*Si unius delicto
multi mortui sunt,
multo*

102 *The several ways of resolving Faith.*

The words of the Creed. The Texts of Scripture.

*multo magis gratia
Dei, & donum in
gratia unius homi-
nis Jesu Christi in
plures abundavit,
Rom. 5. 15.*

*Crucifixus etiam
sub Pontio Pilato.*

*Vide Matth. 27.
Marc. 15. Luc.
23. John 19.*

Pro nobis.

*Christus semel
pro peccato passus
est, iustus pro inju-
stis, ut nos offerret
Deo, mortificatus
quidem carne, vi-
vificatus autem spi-
ritu, 1 Pet. 3. 18.*

*Dignus es acci-
pere librum & spe-
rire signaculum
ejus,*

in the Roman and Reformed Churches.

The words of the Creed. The Texts of Scripture.

*ejus, quoniam occi-
sus es, & redemisti
nos Deo in sangui-
ne tuo ex omni tri-
bu, & lingua, &
populo, & natione,
Rev. 5. 9.*

Passus.

*Pilatus miraba-
tur si jam obuisset;
& accersito Centu-
rione interrogabat
eum, si jam mortu-
us esset; & quum
cognovisset à Cen-
turione, donavit
corpus, Josephi.
Marc. 15. 44. 45.
vide Matth. 27.
50. Luc. 23. 46.
Joh. 19. 30.*

The several ways of resolving Faith

The words of the Creed.

The Texts of Scripture.

Et sepultus est.

Et accepto corpore Joseph involvit illud in sindone munda, & posuit illud in monumento suo novo, quod exciderat in petra, & advolvitis saxum magnum ad ostium monumenti, & abiit, Matth. 27. 59, 60. vide Marc. 15 46. Luc. 23. 53. Joh. 19. 40, 41, 42.

Et resurrexit tertiâ die secundum Scripturas.

Vide Matth. 28. Marc 16. Luc. 24. Joh. 20.

Et ascendit in caelum, sedet ad

Dominus quidem Iesus postquam locutus,

The words of the Creed.

The Texts of Scripture.

dextram Patris.

*cutus est, assumptus
est in cælum, & se-
dit à dextris Pa-
tris, Marc. 16. 19.
vide Luc. 24. 51,
Act. 1. 9.*

*Quicùm sit splen-
dor gloria, & figu-
ra substantia ejus,
portansque omnia,
verbo virtutis suæ
purgationem pecca-
torum faciens, sedet
ad dextram Maje-
statis in excelsis,
Heb. 1. 3. vide
Heb. 8. 1, 1 Pet.
3. 22.*

*Et iterum ven-
turus est cum gloria*

*Quoniam ipse Do-
minus in jussu, &*

in

The words of the Creed. The Texts of Scripture.

judicare vivos & mortuos.

*in voce Archangel-
li, & in tuba Dei
descendit de Cælo,
& mortui in Chri-
sto resurgent primi,
1 Thes. 4. 16.*

*Præcepit nobis
prædicare populo,
& testificari quia
ipse est, qui consti-
tutus est iudex vi-
vorum, & mortuo-
rum, Acts 10. 42.*

*Testificor coram
Deo & Jesu Chri-
sto, qui judicaturus
est vivos & mor-
tuos, & per adven-
tum ipsius & reg-
num ejus, 2 Tim.
4. 1.*

*Qui reddent ra-
tionem*

The words of the Creed.

Quius regni non
erit finis.

Credo unam san-
ctam Catholicam,
& Apostolicam Ec-
clesiam,

The Texts of Scripture.

tionem ei, qui para-
tus est judicare vi-
vos & mortuos,
1 Pet. 4. 5.

Regni ejus non
erit finis, Luc. 1. 33.
vid. Revel. 11. 15.

Euntes docete
omnes gentes bap-
tizantes eos in no-
mine Patris & Fi-
lii & Sancti Spi-
ritus.

Docentes eos ser-
vare omnia que-
cunque mandavi
vobis; & ecce ego
vobiscum sum om-
nibus diebus usque
ad consummatio-
nem.

08 *The several ways of resolving Faith*

The words of the Creed.

The Texts of Scripture.

*sem seculi, Matth.
28. 19. 20.*

*Ipse est caput
corporis Ecclesie,
Coloss. 1. 18.*

*Alias oves habeo
qua non sunt ex
hoc ovili, & illas
me oportet adduce-
re, & vocem me-
am audient, &
fiet unum ovile &
unus Pastor, John
10. 16.*

*Confiteor unum
Baptisma in remis-
sionem peccatorum.*

*Unus Dominus,
una Fides, unum
Baptisma, Ephes.
4. 5.*

*Penitentiam a-
gite & baptizetur
unusquisque ve-
strum*

The words of the Creed.

The Texts of Scripture.

*strum in nomine
Jesu Christi in re-
missionem peccato-
rum vestrorum,
Acts 2. 38.*

*An ignoratis
quia quicunq; bap-
tizati sumus in
Christo Jesu, in
mortem ipsius bap-
tizati sumus?*

*Consepulti enim
sumus cum illo per
Baptismum in mor-
tem, ut quomodo
Christus surrexit
à mortuis per glo-
riam Patris, ita &
nos in novitate vi-
tæ ambulemus.*

*Si enim complan-
tati facti sumus si-
milis*

110 *The several ways of resolving Faith*

The words of the Creed. The Texts of Scripture

*multitudini mortis
ejus, simul & re-
surrectionis eri-
mus.*

*Hoc scientes quia
vetus homo noster
simul crucifixus est,
ut destruaturs cor-
pus peccati, ut ul-
trà non serviamus
peccato.*

*Qui enim mor-
tuus est, justifica-
tus est à peccato,
Rom. 6. ver. 1. 2;
3, 4, 5, 6, 7.*

*Baptizare & ab-
luere peccata tua in-
vocato nomine ip-
sius, Acts 22. 16.*

Et expecto re-

*Si resurrectio
mor;*

The word of the Creed. The Texts of Scripture.

surrectionem mortuorum.

*mortuorum non est,
neque Christus re-
surrexit.*

*Si autem Chri-
stus non resurrexit,
inanis ergo predi-
catio, inanis est
Fides vestra. 1 Cor.
15. v. 13. 14.*

*Et vitam venturi
seculi, Amen.*

*Amen dico vobis,
nemo est qui reli-
querit domum, aut
fratres, aut sorores,
aut Patrem, aut
Matrem, &c. prop-
ter me, & propter
Evangelium.*

*Qui non accipiet
tantum
nunc in tempore,
&c. & in seculo
sa-*

The several ways of resolving Faith

The words of the Creed • The Texts of Scripture.

futuro vitam eter-
nam, Marc. 10.

29. 30.

Vide Matth. 25.

46. 1 Cor. 15.

ver. 52, 53, 54.

1 Thess. 4. ver.

16. 17.

Many more *Texts* of *Scripture*, besides these here produc'd, might, if need were, be added for confirmati-on, That the mention'd *Articles* contain'd in the *Nicene Creed*, are as plain and clearly to be found in *Scripture*, as in it.

Granting, Will the *Traditionists* peradventure say, the truth of what I here affirm ; yet may both the *Scripture*, and the *Creed*, be further clear'd and explicated. No doubt, but they may, supposing them first
to

to be *rightly* understood; but how they should be that, unless they be plainly significative of *one determinate sense*, I am not able to apprehend. If the *Traditionists* reply, yes, they may be understood *aright* from this, that men see the *same* things taught *dayly* among *Christians*. I answer, That of *several Words* or *Sentences* compar'd together, it cannot with *certainty* be affirm'd, they import the *same* thing, save only by *those* to whom they're *known* to be plainly significative of *one determinat sense*. Nor does this at all hinder, why as well the *Scripture* as the *Creed*, may not to the *multitude* be made *more* plain and easie to be understood, then of *themselves* they can in reason be thought to *appear* to them. Yea, some people, I believe there be, whose *Intellects* are so weak and stupid, that scarce any *one single* forme of words whatso

ever, can be fully adapted to their capacities; whence even the *easiest* Catechismes that are fram'd, we see, are with much diligence explain'd by the *Catechist*; yea and not a few, I fear, of his own words us'd for explication of others, often stand need themselves of exposition to some of his Auditors; so that what is very plain and ealie to be understood by *some* men, may to *others* be obscure and difficult,

S E C T. IX.

What the properties of the Rule of Christian Faith be? and whether they agree to holy Scripture?

Although I have clear'd the Scripture from the unjust imputation

tion of unintelligibleness in Matters of Catholick Faith cast upon it; yet unless, besides, that it is *plainly significative of one determinate sense*, it have likewise these two further Properties, *viz*, That it contain all things of necessary Belief and Practice; and so, as that an explicit knowledge of them be attainable, it cannot be the Rule of Christian Faith. For since the very Ground and Reason why some Scriptural Doctrins are call'd necessary in contradistinction to others other, wise, is from hence; that they are held necessary to be *plainly understood*, to the intent the Credenda of them may be *explicitly believed*, the Agenda frequently practis'd in order to salvation, all Necessaries must of necessity be so far distinctly known, as is requisite to that end and purpose, And therefore I find no satisfaction from the saying of those who tell us, that he who believes all Doctrines

K 2

clearly

116 *The several ways of resolving Faith*

clearly deliver'd in Scripture, believes all things necessary to Salvation, and much more; because if they speak of an implicit Belief, that, in Necessaries to salvation is not sufficient; and to have an explicit Belief of all Doctrins (almost infinite) clearly held forth in Sacred Writ, is not a thing practicable. The three mentioned Qualifications then, First, That Scripture be intelligible in Matters of Catholick Faith. Secondly, That it be comprehensive of them. Thirdly, That they be distinguishable in Scripture, (though not by it, for that I have formerly shewn is not to be expected) from most other Truths (I do not say all, for to have an exact Catalogue of all Necessaries distinct from every other Scriptural Doctrin, is not, as I think, possible; so neither, I am sure necessary; because if nothing necessary be omitted, it matters not how many Truths besides what are necessary

sary be explicitly known together with them) *clearly contained in it*, are all of them requisit to Scripture, if we will have it to be the *Rule of Christian Faith*. Which Qualifications, whether they do accord to Scripture, or no, let's make some tryall if we can discover.

Besides what I have already said to the *first*, (*viz.* That *Scripture is intelligible*, or plainly significative of *one determinat sense in necessities to salvation*) many *Arguments* both from *it self*, and the *Fathers*, are brought by the Learned to prove, that *it* and the *second* also, (namely, That the *Holy Scripture* comprehends whatsoever is of *necessary belief* and *practice*) pertain to *Holy Writ*; and if they were not stretch'd further by some, then they'l without *forcing* extend, I see not how they could reasonably be deni'd to be

convincing. For all be it *Scripture* be not clear in all things necessary to salvation to every one, yet it may be to some, who are able to use the best *Means* attainable for the understanding it in those things, aright. This the great *Promoter* and *Advancer* of the *Traditionary Doctrine* *Thomas Angelus ex Albiis*, in his *Sonus Buccina*, seems plainly to me to confess, who *Tractat* 2. *Paragr.* 19. in answer to this *Objection*, *Sancti Patres testantur sacras Scripturas esse sufficientes ad nos instruendos, & continere omnia quæ ad Fidem, & Mores spectant; & quidem sine magno labore*; saith, *Aliud est omnia necessaria in sacra Scriptura contineri, aliud eam esse Regulam*; sicut aliud est esse aliquid rectum in se, aliud verò esse Regulam; ut enim Rectum sit Regula debet esse applicabile, possunt autem sic obscure vel disperse contineri necessaria in Libris sacris,

ut non nisi cum labore, & à solis doctis possint fieri vel agnosci certa.
 According to what is here writ, *Scripture* is not deni'd to have *rectitude* enough in it to be a *Rule*; and so might be the *Rule of Faith*, if it were but applicable, that is such, as might certainly be learn'd from it, *What things are revealed in it by God as necessary to bring men to Felicity.* Whether therefore the *sacred Scripture* be such, or no, shall be my next *Enquiry*.

Of the *three Qualifications* requisite to constitute *Scripture* the *Rule of Faith*, two are found to belong to it, viz. it's intelligibleness in things necessary to salvation; and it's comprehensiveness of them. The third, which is, That those necessities be distinguishable from other *Scriptural Truths*, so far as is requisite to gain an explicit knowledge of them, I will next so consider of, as to make it my business to search out, Whether or no

K 4

they

they may be *so distinctly* known; and in case they may, by what *Means* it is to be done. By what *Means* would some say, but by *Scripture*? For if by *Scripture* it self the *distinct* knowledge of them cannot be attain'd unto, *Scripture* will not of it self point us out our *Way* to *Heaven*, and consequently, is not the *Rule of Faith*. I deny the *Consequence*; for if *Scripture* be intelligible in all things necessary to salvation, and that by any *Means* we can attain to a *distinct* knowledge of them, we shall assuredly by *Scripture* be shewn our *Way* to *Heaven*, and consequently, *Scripture* will be the *Rule of Faith*; for that is (I conceive) the *Rule of Faith* into which it is finally resolv'd as an *infallible Witness* of it, let the *Helps* antecedently requisite to that *Resolution* be what, or as many as they will, since these latter only directs us to that,

*that, which directs us our Way to
Bliss.*

Here some perhaps would be ready to offer another Objection, to this purpose ; *Necessary Points* are reducible to a very few, perchance to this one, *To believe and trust in Jesus Christ for remission of sinns* (and of this *Doctrin*, the *Scripture* it self teaches a *necessity*) which they might the more confidently insist on, because it seems to be confirm'd by that remarkable Instance of the penitent *Thief* on the *Cross*. To this might be answer'd, that although the *Thief* on the *Cross* who believ'd in *Christ* was sav'd without an *explicit* knowledge of the *Resurrection*, *Ascension* and *Coming to Judgment* of our *Blessed Saviour*, because by reason of the *Circumstances* he was in, *true Holiness*, or the *sincere love of God in Christ* was wrought in his heart ; yet it cannot be rationally inferr'd from

12 *The several ways of resolving Faith*

from thence, that the *Resurrection*, *Ascension* and *Coming to Judgment* of our *Lord* are not *Points*, which the *Rule of Faith* holds forth, as *Articles of Catholick and Apostolick Belief*. For what in some extraordinary Circumstances may be an efficacious means to work *Contrition* and a through amendment of *Life* to *salvation* in one, the same will not be so to others in the common and ordinary course of *Mans* life; and to this must the *Rule of Faith* extend, I mean to afford *Motives*, or *Matters of Belief*, and *Precepts of good life and Manners*, apt and convenient to bring multitudes of people following their several *Vocations* to dye unto *Sin*, and to live unto *Righteousness*, whose *Crown* is *Everlasting life and Bliss*. Several *Necessaries* then there are in respect of *Mankind*, and although every one of them be not absolutely necessary for every individual person

to know, yet in that they are more generally necessary to be known, the *Rule of Faith* would be imperfect if it wanted any one of them. And therefore, I conceive, I have very good ground and cause to think, that the *Fundamentals* of the *Christian Religion* are more then those *divine Truths* (whatever they be) which are so necessary, that not any one man can be sav'd without an express knowledge of them; because more *Motives*, and more *Precepts*, will in all reason, be necessary to bring a multitude in different *Conditions*, and various *Circumstances* to a true sense of their *sinns*, and an hearty turning from them to God, then to work the like effect in some one, or a few persons in some *advantageous Circumstances*, which may supply the defect of several *Credenda* and *Agenda* in influencing the *Mind*, that otherwise will be necessary for the conversion of others

4 *The several ways of resolving Faith
others, not in the same or like helpfull
Circumstances with them; and so of
right belong to the Rule of Faith.*

The two past Objections solv'd, I
return to my *Queries*, Whether or
no, all necessities to salvation be so
far distinguishable in Scripture as to
be explicitly known; and in case
they be, by what means an explicit
knowledge of them is attainable.
If such a knowledge of them be at-
tainable, it must be by one of these four
ways; Either by Scripture it self;
or by some other Writing of Ca-
tholick truth and authority; or by
evident Reason; or lastly, by Tra-
dition. Not by Scripture, the Scri-
pturists themselves (as was said be-
fore) acknowledge. Nor is there any
other Book of Catholick truth and au-
thority (I ever heard of) undertakes
to direct to them. And as for Prin-
ciples of meer Reason, or Science
grounded on the Credenda and Agen-
da

in the Roman and Reformed Churches.

As themselves, we cannot expect to have any certain distinct notice of them from either of them, because a necessity of such *Truths* as are above human ingeny, or meerly positive (as there be several of both sorts in *Scripture*) is not to be learn'd from thence. There's but onely one thing then remaining, which can possibly give intelligence of them, and 'tis *Tradition*, taken either in this sense, That *such and such places of Scripture have been ever held and taught to contain all necessities to salvation*; an Assertion never (I think) maintain'd; or els in this sense, as 'tis said to be, *A constant uninterrupted course of teaching, learning and practicing Christs Doctrine, set on foot by our blessed Saviour, and his Apostles, and continued by their Disciples, and the succeeding Generations ever since*; which course, if it have been really taken, the difficulty of getting an express

26 *The several ways of resolving Faith*

press knowledge of Necessaries contain'd in Scripture will terminate in knowing what Divine Truths have been so convey'd, and then finding Texts in Holy Writ parallel thereunto. First, then it must be sought after; Whether Christian Doctrine has by such a continued course been brought down to us, or not? And secondly, What the Truthes, if indeed there were any so brought down, be?

S E C T. X.

An Enquiry, whether Christs Doctrine has been practically convey'd without intermission from the days of the Apostles unto ours? And of what validity?
Four

*Four grand Arguments urg'd
against the indefectibility of
Tradition, are?*

WHether *Christs Doctrin* has been *Orally* deliver'd and *practically* handed down to us without *interruption*, I shall by this that follows, labour to satisfie my self.

That there is no real Benefit accrues to *Christians* by the *Rule of Faith*, if the Things contain'd in it, be not *explicitly believ'd*, and *sincerely practic'd*, is, I presume, unquestionably true. The *exercise* therefore of *Christianity* being the *End* for which the *Rule of Faith* (we'l suppose it *Scripture*) was given, and is preserv'd, 'twould be strangely unreasonable to think, that the *Means* should have been so carefully kept in *all Ages*, as even with the hazard, yea, and loss of life it hath often been; and the *End* it self, for which it was so kept, should

The several ways of resolving Faith

should not with *equal* care (at least) have been regarded.

But further, and more particularly thus; *Christs Doctrin* consists of *Credenda* and *Agenda*, which the *Apostles* and *Evangelists*, before they were committed to *writing*, and after also, orally taught to *multitudes* of people, who *cordially* embrac'd them, being fully perswaded that their own and their *Posterities eternal welfare* depended on the *Belief* and *Practice* of them. So long therefore as the *same Motives* which so inclin'd these *primitive Christians* shall remain among men and *affect* them, (which will be as was shewn Section, 7. to the worlds end) so long there shall be *teaching, learning, and practicing* the *Necessaries* to *Salvation* compos'd of the *Credenda* and *Agenda* of the *Gospel*. The former of which, if they be as *few* as many tell us they are, (*viz.* those compris'd within the *Apostolical Creed*)

In the Roman and Reformed Churches

Creed, no doubt might with ease have been orally transmitted from *Age* to *Age* till now, and may be so, while the world lasts. As for the *Agenda*, or *Things* of necessary practice, the *Lords Prayer*, and our *Duty* towards *God* and *Man*, comprehended chiefly in the *Ten Commandments*, they are not much more difficult to be learn'd and kept in mind. Add to these the *Sacraments*, the continual celebration of which perpetuates them, and we have (by the Consent of the *Scripturists*) the substance of *Christianity*. But admit the *Credenda* and *Agenda*, which ought explicitly to be believ'd and duly practic'd, were as many more, yet would so small a *Catechism* contain them all, as *Children* and the *vulger* sort might generally, without much labour, be taught. That the *Necessaries* therefore to *Salvation* should ever fail to be practically transmitted from *Generation* to *Genera-*

tion is a like impossible; as that *multitudes* of people should not in every *Age* be truly desirous of their *own*, and their *Posterities* everlasting Happiness, seeing (as I have shew'd) 'tis a thing easy and necessary to *Salvation* to be perform'd, to perpetuate *Christs* Doctrine by a continued practical Delivery of it, till the Consummation of all things.

However clear the truth of this may seem, yet in regard I meet with four grand Arguments urg'd stiffly against the *indefectibility* of Tradition, two of which are thought (by some) to be grounded on firm Reason; the other two on certain Experience; 'twill be requisite well to consider of them, and to try their strength.

The first is, That *Moral* Causes work not necessarily, and therefore it cannot be certainly concluded that however strongly the Motives for the practical continuance of *Christs* Doctrine

be appli'd to the mind, the Will will undoubtedly embrace them, and act according to them. This first Argument is sufficiently (I think) answer'd, Section, 7. yet for fuller conviction I will add this here, that the same Argument if appli'd to Scripture, would prove as much every jot against Scriptures preservation, as against the continuance of Tradition. If it be repli'd, that Gods Goodness is engag'd for the preservation of Scripture; I grant it; if man use his own endeavours, otherwise, God is not (I conceive) concern'd to preserve it; for I presume no man of sound Reason will say, that God is oblig'd by his Goodness immediately to save it Himself, or to commit the safeguard of it to the sole care of Angels, when Men, whose Concern it is to preserve it, are sufficient (if there be no default in themselves) for the work. If Mans endeavours therefore for the conservation of it

be free in that sense which the Objection supposes every action of Man to be, there will be no more certainty of the continuance of *Scripture*, then of the *practical Delivery* of *Christs Doctrine* throughout all *Generations*; and if the *Church* should at any time be without it's *Rule of Faith*, 'twould either dwindle away to nothing, or become a meer Babel of Anarchy and Confusion.

The *second Argument* to prove, That *Tradition* is not of an *indefectible* nature is this; *If men be not free, it is no virtue at all in them to be wrought upon by Moral Motives*; for what virtue can it be in any man to entertain the *Christian Doctrine*, and adhere to it whether he will or no? I willingly grant, it is no virtue in any man to do a thing whether he will or no; for to do a thing whether a man will or no, is (according to the common use

use of the Phrase) to do it *against his Will*, which as to the *actus elicited* of the *Will*, involves this manifest Contradiction, to *will* and *not will* at once the *same* thing. The words therefore, *whether he will or no*, must be interpreted, to mean, here in the Objection, no more then *necessarily*, or rather, in propriety of Speech, *certainly*; for, I take a *necessary* effect in the most strict and proper notion of it, to be an effect wrought in a Subject wholly *passive*; whereas the *Will* is an *active Principle*, and always *determines* it self, however powerfully the *Motives* work upon it. Whence it is, that even the blessed *Saints* and *Angels* in Heaven, though their affections be most strongly and unalterably fix'd on *God*, are not necessitated thereto without their *own great good-liking*, and *active tendency* to the enjoyment of their *Sovereign Good*. If then the *fruition*

34 *The several ways of resolving Faith,*

of the very *End*, be so voluntary, that the *Will* is *active* therein, 'tis certainly so, in respect of the *Means* conducing to it, to the choice whereof, *deliberation* is prerequir'd; the office of which *deliberation*, is to consult *what means* will be most available to obtain the design'd *End* by; the *principal* of which in *Morals*, is Mans *Summum Bonum*, or *sovereign Good*, namely, the *fruition* of *God* whereunto as well the *Moral* as *Theological Vertues* are conduci-
ble *Means*; so that to be *actually virtuous*, is to act for the enjoyment of the *Chief Good*, in a way *proper* for the attaining of it; which to do the more *stedfastly*, *constantly*, and certainly, were not, I should think, to do less, but rather more *virtuously*, yet without infringing the *Liberty* of the *Will*, which retains always it's *native power*, when it so *likes*, to do *otherwise*. But in case the

habe

habit of Virtue in any man grow so strong and potent, that it perpetually incline him to pursue his *Chief Good*, I hope, the enjoyment of *God*, will not be made such a necessary effect thereby, as that he'll enjoy *God*, whether *himselfe* will or no. The certainty therefore of a thing wrought by *Moral Causes*, is no evidence that Man is not endued with *Free-will*, but only shews that the *Motives* act so vigorously and powerfully considering the present disposition of the Mind, and the Circumstances a man is in, that the *Wills native indifferency* to will or not to will, is cast by them on that side, which makes for producing the *Effect*, but yet so, that it's the *Wills* own choice to do it, which determines *itself* by reason of the present agreeableness and gratefullness of the *Motives* thereunto. For unless we'll deny the constant Experience of all Ages, we must needs confess, that there is a

certainty of divers Effects in the course of several things in the world (such as were mentioned *Section 7*, besides many more not spoken of) which flow from *Moral Motives*, so that it would be more tolerable if there were no way to reconcile *Free-will*, and that *certainty*, to make doubt of the former, rather then of the latter; but we see, by what has been said, That a *certainty* of effects, proceeding from *Moral Causes*, and the *native Liberty* of *Mans Will*, may well enough consist together.

The other two Arguments brought to prove, That *Tradition* is defective, are Founded on two *Instances*, the former of which is this; *The Tradition of the one true God was in a short time so defac'd and corrupted, that the world did laps into Polytheism and Idolatry, although it was settled in the heart of Noah, and firmly believ'd by him to be the way to Happiness, and*
the

the contradicting and deserting this to be the way to Misery; and this Doctrin according to the Traditionists, must be suppos'd, to have been so taught to his children, and by them also to their Posterity. To this I answer, first, that there is not the like reason why a Doctrin committed only to three Families, should be so permanent, as that which is entrusted to millions of people, albeit the Motives for the preservation of it were the same. But I secondly answer, that the Motives for propagating Christianity are far more excellent, then the Motives which Noah and his Sons had for the continuing the belief of the one true God. For the express motives in ancient time, both before, and under the Law, were only temporall rewards and punishments, which because they were seen to befall the bad and good promiscuously; in that some of both sorts abounded with Riches and Honour, and others had their

138 *The several ways of resolving Faith*

their *afflictions*; 'tis obvious to conceive, considering the frequent temptations to *Ambition*, *Luxury*, and *Avarice*, that men would be farr less intent to regard *Truth*, and exercise acts of *Piety* and *Vertue*, when *everlasting Bliss* and *Misery* were only gather'd by Consequence to be the final Portion of good and evill men; then when in *express* words they were constantly prels'd, and inculcated as *Motives*, the one to incline men to embrace *Truth* and *Goodness*; the other, to deterr them from *Error* and *Vice*, as since the Preaching of *Christs Gospel* they have ever been. Neither, which I *thirdly*, and lastly Answer, will it be granted, That the *Tradition* of the *one true God* ever faild, or was totally lost, till it appear that *Abraham* and *Lot*, had noe knowledge of *Him* from *Sem*, or some of his *Progeny*. Could *Abraham* (saith Dr. *Stillingsfleet*, *Origin.*
Sacr.

Sacr. Book 2. Chap. 2. Sect. 9.) when he was contemporary with *Sem*, be ignorant of the Truth of the Flood, when *Sem*, from whom he deriv'd himself, was one of the Persons who escap'd it in the *Ark* ? Could *Sem* be ignorant of the actions before the Flood, when *Adam*, the first Man, lived some part of his time with *Noah* ? And could *Noah* then be ignorant of the *Creation*, and *Fall* of *Man* ? The same Learned *Author* in the same *Sect.* a little before, writeth thus ; *Adam* conversed sometime with *Noah* ; *Sem* his Son, was probably living in some part of *Jacobs* time, or *Isaacs* at least ; And how easily, and *uninterruptedly* might the general *Tradition* of the ancient *History*, be continued thence to the time of *Moses*, when the number of Families agreeing in this *Tradition* was increas'd, and withall incorporated by a common ligament of *Religion* ?

140 *The several ways of resolving Faith*

I demand then (saith the Doctor) where can we suppose any ignorance, or cutting off this *general Tradition*, in so continued a *Succession* as here was ?

The latter *Instance* offer'd to disprove the *Indefeasibility* of *Tradition* by, is about the *Procession* of the *Holy Ghost*, which the *Latin Church* (saith the *Objection*) affirms, is from the *Father*, and the *Son*, and a necessary *Article* of *Faith* ; the *Greek Church* holding, That He proceeds only from the *Father*, and not from the *Son*, disowning any such *Doctrine* to have been deliver'd to them by the *precedent Age*, or to any other *Age* of their *Church*, as the *Doctrine* of *Christ*, and yet no question can be made, but that if the *Procession* of the *Holy Spirit* from the *Father* and the *Son*, be an *Article* of *Faith*, it was taught in the *Greek*, as well as in the *Latin Church* ; and therefore

fore the *Non-belief* of it in the *Greek Church*, is an evident *Argument* of the *actual failure* of *Tradition* in this *Point*, and of the *possibility* of it's failings in *others* also.

To this, I return, That seeing the *Doctrin* of the *Blessed Trinity*, and more especially of the *Holy Ghost* was purposely handled in the *Second General Council* held at *Constantinople*, which was principally call'd for confuting and condemning *Macedonius*, who deni'd the *Divinity* of the *Holy Ghost*, and that nevertheless, no mention is made in the *Creed* there set forth of his *procession*, save from the *Father*, *ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς ἐκπορευόμενος*, and also the same *Creed* was not only receiv'd but continued likewise a long time after in the *Latin Church*, without the addition of *ἐκ τοῦ υἱοῦ* it seems strongly probable (at least) that the *procession* of the *Holy Ghost* from the *Son*, was not thought by

142 *The several ways of resolving Faith*

by the *Constantinopolitan Fathers* to be an *Article of Catholick Faith*, seeing it was so obvious, so easie, and one would think so opportune also, after *the 7th Article* to have added *and the 8th*, if they had indeed believ'd it to be an *Article of Faith*. The excuse that some make why they did it not, which is, that there was none as yet who denied the *procession* of the *Holy Ghost* from the *Son*, seems trivial, since it was the very *Divinity* of the *Holy Spirit* that *Macedonius* oppos'd, which alone therefore, if the excuse were good, should have been asserted by the *Council*, and the *contrary opinion* thereto only condemned. But whatever was the cause or the occasion why *and the 8th* was omitted (which I wave) this is certain that the *Doctrine* of the *Holy Ghosts procession* from the *Son*, is either an *Article of Catholick Faith*, or it is not; if it be not, *Tradition* is no way concern'd, let the
Greeks

Greeks and Latins too hold whether way they please about it. If it be an *Article of Faith*, and that the *Greek and Latin Churches* agree in the *substance and sence* of it, and differ only in the manner of the *expression*, there has been no *failure of Tradition* in the *Greek Church* concerning the *procession* of the *Holy Ghost*. Forasmuch then as it remains only to be known, whether the *Greeks and Latins* agree in *Sence*, though they differ in *words*, or the *Greeks* $\text{ὁ ἅγιος πνεῦμα ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς, ὡς ἐκ τοῦ υἱοῦ}$, *per Filium* be the same in effect with the *Latin* $\text{ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς, ὡς ἐκ τοῦ υἱοῦ}$, *à Filio*, let's see what the *Roman Doctors* (who we may be sure will be no more favourable to the *Greeks* then's fitting) say to't. *Peter Lombert*, writing of the *Procession* of the *Holy Ghost* from the *Father* and the *Son*, saith; *Sciendum est quod Græci consentiunt Spiritum Sanctum, esse Filii sicut & Patris, quia & Apostolus dicit Spiritum Filii, & Veritas*

in Evangelio Spiritum Veritatis. Sed cum non sit aliud Spiritum Sanctum esse Patris vel Filii, quam esse à Patre & Filio, etiam in hoc in eandem, nobiscum Fidei sententiam convenire videntur, licet in verbis dissentiant. Unde etiam quidam eorum Catholici Doctores intelligentes unam eandemque, fore sententiam prædictorum verborum, quibus dicitur Spiritus Sanctus procedere à Filio, & esse Filii, professi sunt Spiritum Sanctum etiam procedere à Filio, Lib. 1. Sentent. Distinct. 11. D. E. Where the same Author goes on, to shew, That several eminent Greek Fathers, Athanasius, Didymus, Cyrillus, and Chrysostom accord even in expressions also about the Procession of the Holy Ghost. Aquinas propounding the Question, Utrum Spiritus Sanctus procedat à Patre per Filium, concludes affirmatively, and answers Objections made to the contrary, as is to be seen

Part prima. Quæst. 26. Artic. 3. Yea,
 and Mr. White, however in the *Apo-*
logie for Tradition, he calls the *Greeks*
assertion, concerning the *Holy Ghost's*
Procession, (as is truly said of him)
 a meer negative Tradition, or a De-
 nial that they have any such Tradi-
 tion, that the *Holy Spirit* proceeds
 from the *Father and the Son*; yet,
 explicating els where, the sacred My-
 stery of the *Blessed Trinity*, avers
 it to be a more significant Speech to
 say, that the *Holy Ghost* proceeds
 from the *Father by the Son*, then
 from the *Father and the Son*, which
 in illustrating the *Doctrine* of the
Trinity by *Cognitum, Cognitio &*
Amor, he thus shews; *Patet vim*
motivam qua est in Bono cognito, esse
totam in ratione Boni, rationem verò
cognitionis non esse, nisi conjunctionem
hujus virtutis ad movendum; quare
alio modo dicitur tertia Persona Pro-
cedere à Patre, & alio modo à Filio, &

146 *The several ways of resolving Faith*

quasi directè & principaliter à Patre, & à Filio, non nisi concomitanter seu tanquam à modo Causæ. Unde non mirum, si Christus Dominus, & aliqui Patres disertè, dicant eum procedere à Patre, sine mentione Filii; unde intelligitur, quòd sit magis expressiva locutio dicere, quòd procedit à Patre per Filium, quàm quòd procedit à Patre & Filio. Cum enim per quasi viam, & medium denotet, impossibile est procedere per Filium, & non à Filio, quia omnis pars viæ respectu termini, habet rationem termini à quo & principii, unde ly per explicat & esse à, & à non primo principio.

S E C T. XI.

*What rational assurance we have,
That Scripture is not corrupted
in Necessaries to salvation. The
way to know what things have
been ever Orally taught. Two
Reasons given, why Tradition,
though it be of an indefectible
nature, should not be the Rule
of Faith. Whether a fundamen-
tal Error, can ever obtain a
a settled quiet possession in the
visible Church? An offer from
Reason, for the impossibility of
the thing. Errors not-fundamen-
tal, may overspread the Church,
and why? Several instances of
such Errors in the Roman
Church.*

THe practical delivery of *Christs Doctrine* never (as has been seen) *failing*; it may, by carefully searching the *Scripture*, be known, *what things* contain'd in it are of necessity to be generally believ'd and practis'd (because no more is so, but what has been always believ'd, and practis'd by *Christians*) provided assurance may be had, *what* has been ever practically deliver'd; and that *Scripture* is not corrupted in such places of it, as contain the *Necessaries* to *salvation*, or *Articles* of *Catholick* and *Apostolick Faith*.

For the latter, (which I'll first insist on) That *Scripture* is not corrupted in necessary Points, I shall briefly say but this; Since the *actings* of *Gods Providence* are not known to us, but as they are seen in *second Causes*, the most rational account we have, That *Scripture* is come safe to our hands, without Corruption in all things of

of necessity to be generally believ'd, and practic'd, is from hence; that *Scripture* being constantly read by multitudes of *Knowing Christians*, could not possibly be corrupted in *Texts* containing such things as were perpetually taught, repeated, and practic'd in the *Church* (of which sort the *Necessaries* to *Salvation* are) without being taken notice of, and if occasion requir'd, rectified.

As for satisfaction in the other difficulty, viz. *What things have been ever orally taught*, this in general, from what has been sayd, appears certain, that *no Point of Christ's Doctrin* shall ever fail. And although in this or that Place, the continuance of *Christian Faith* be not necessary, yet where ever there has been a *visible great Society* of *Christians*, wherein it was once firmly settled, and which has had a constant *succession* of *Pastors* continued in it, *nothing* held by that

Society to be an *Article of Faith*, could totally cease to be so esteem'd, unless so vast a *Body* (in which there would be in every *Age* a considerable number of *wise* and *pious* men) could either be *universally* impos'd on by *fraud*, or forc'd by *violence*; or that all it's *Members* would *carelessly* neglect, or *wilfully* forsake, what they believ'd to be a *necessary* Means to save *themselves*, and their *Posterity* from *endless Torment*, and to bring them to *everlasting Joy*. *Universally* then *such* a *Body* could neither desert, nor loose it's *Faith*, in any *necessary Point*. And in case any *remarkable Member*, or *Part* thereof, should ever do it, 'twould be known, and presently oppos'd by the *sound Part* adhering to the *Truth*, as constant *Experience* has made evident in the timely resisting of all *Heresies*. This, if granted to be true, plain reason will enforce our assent, that the *La-*

tin or Western Church, being such a Society, as is before mentioned, did at the begining of the Reformation, and still does hold and maintain all the Articles of Catholick and Apostolick Faith.

Obiection, If the Latin, or Western Church, when the Reformation begun, did really hold all the Articles of Catholick and Apostolick Faith, by vertue of Oral Tradition communicating the same unto it; what good cause can be shewn, why Tradition should not be the Rule of Faith, even without having the Doctrins it delivers confirm'd by parallel Texts of Holy Writ?

Answer, since the Rule of Faith must doubtless be that, into which it is ultimately resolv'd, as the best and highest Means of ascertaining Christs Doctrin to Mankind; and that the same must contain in it no Error; this Inference (I think) will be clear; that in case Oral Tradition, or

the *Living voice of the Church*, either be not the *best and highest means* whereby to ascertain *Christs Doctrin* to Mankind; or that it may deliver, or teach an *Error* under the notion of an *Article of Faith*, it cannot be in justice esteem'd the *Rule of Faith*. And that *Oral Tradition*, or the *Living voice of the Church*, is not the *best, and highest means* whereby to ascertain *Christs Doctrin* to Mankind, the following *Paragraph* (I think) will make good.

Where *two Testimonies* both aver and attest the *same thing*; if the one be of *Divine*, the other but of *Humane Authority*; the *Testimony* that is *Divine* ought of *Right* to have the *preeminence*, and the *relyance* for the *verity* of what is *witnessed* by them, is to be *ultimately* cast upon it. Seeing then the *Testimony of Scripture* is *Divine*, as being, *ex confesso*, the *Word of God*; and *Tradition* but

an *Humane Witness*, forasmuch as it is said to be the *Delivery of Christs Doctrine* in the various expressions of *Pastors, Parents, Tutors, Masters of Families, and Nurses*, 'tis most reasonable, that Faith should be finally resolved into *Scripture*, (and not into *Tradition*) as it's *Rule*. Yea and albeit *Tradition* may peradventure in some things be thought more plain then *Scripture*; (as for example, suppose in the Point of *Christs Divinity*, these words of the *Nicene Creed*; *Deum de Deo, Lumen de Lumine, Deum verum de Deo vero; genitum non factum, consubstantialem Patri per quem omnia facta sunt;*) yet that *Scripture* should be still esteem'd the *Text*, and *Tradition* but the best, and most certain *Comment* upon it, I gather from hence, That it cannot well be otherwise thought, but that even the *Disciples of the Apostles* after the *Books of the New Testament* were

pub-

publish'd and receiv'd among Christians, would themselves confirm to their *Auditors*, what they told them they had been *Orally* taught by the *Apostles*, out of the *written Word*; because the *very sayings* of *Christ himself*, and his *divinely inspir'd Apostles*, would in common prudence be thought to be of greater *weight and authority* with them, than their *own*: although beleiv'd to be esteem'd by the people, as true and certain, as any whatioever, not of more than *Humane Authority*.

Having found then (I suppose) one reason, why *Tradition* ought not to be held the *Rule of Faith*; I'll make tryal if in another sense also, it be not incapable of being justly so reputed; for if the *present Church*, of any one Age, can teach us an *Article of Faith* what is not so, but indeed an *Error*; then is not *Tradition* the *Rule of Faith*. Now to find out, whether the *Church*, in any one Age,

Age, can do so, or not, this will be a sure way, to try, if discovery can be made. That any *Error* has been ever taught by the *Catholick Church*, or by any known, and acknowledg'd *Part* of it, as an *Article of Faith*; for if that can be done, the *possibility* of the thing, is put out of doubt thereby.

To make a clear discourse on this subject, 'twill be expedient to consider, That there be *two* sorts of *Errors* in *Matters* of *Religion*; *Fundamental*, and *not Fundamental*. By *Fundamental*, I mean, such as either *immediatly* and *directly*, or, at least, by *necessary* and *apparent* Consequence, contradict some *Articles* of *Catholick Faith*; by *not-Fundamental*, I mean, such as *evidently* do *neither*. This *Distinction* premis'd, and allow'd of; since 'tis clear (as I take it) by what has been said of the *Motives* and *Means* of perpetuating *Christs*,

Christs Doctrin in the World, that no *Article* of *Catholick Faith* can ever *perish* or *cease* to be *beleiv'd*; 'twill follow, that no *Fundamental Error* can at any time get a *settled* and *quiet possession* in the *Church*, but shall always, after it is taken notice of, find *opposition* by *Orthodox Christians*, because they cannot chuse but see, that the *embracing* of it would necessarily *destroy* the *contrary Divine Truth* firmly held (by so many, at least, as rightly consider the matter) to be *necessary* to *Salvation*. Of the assured certainty of this, we have a famous *Instance* in the *Arian Heresie*, which though eagerly promoted by the *Wit* and *industry* of most *cunning* and *restless Heretics*, and stiffly back'd and countenanc'd by the *Authority* of several great *Prelats*, assisted with the *might* and *power* of *Temporal Potentates* and *Princes*; yet was still *oppos'd*; and when *fraudulent*

*dule*nt and *viol*ent means had tyr'd and spent themselves, the *opposit* *Truth* prevail'd, and shew'd it self more *glor*ious then before. But as for *Errors not-Fundamental*, or whose *opposition* to any *Article of Faith* is not seen, because too *remotely* contradictory thereto to be easily discern'd; if *such* once come to be receiv'd as *pious Opinions*, and promoted by the *Schoolmen*, I do not understand, why they may not in long continuance of time, be advanc'd to the *repute* of being esteem'd *Articles of Faith*. For proof of the truth of which, I'll produce some few *Instances* in the *Doctrin* of the *Church of Rome*.

The *first* shall be this, That the *Council of Trent* has defin'd *Sess. 7. Can. 9.* That there is a *Character*, or certain *spiritual sign*, or *mark imprinted in the souls* of all that are *Baptiz'd, Confirm'd, and Ordain'd,*
which

which yet I find disprov'd by an eminently Learned Gentleman of the *Romish Church*, (If I understand the *Council* and *Him* aright) in his *Institut. Sacr. Tom. 2. Lect. 4. Pag. 32.* as was shewn before in *Sect. 4.* of this *Treatise*, and so superfluously to be here again set down.

A second Instance, is the *Belief* of freeing souls from *Purgatory*, and bringing them thence to *Heaven* before the day of *Judgement*; which Opinion, the last mentioned *Author*, *Thomas Albino* in his *Book, De medio animarum statu*, has prov'd to be *erronious*. 'Tis true indeed, he saies, That it is no *Article* of the *Roman Faith*; and I find the *Trent Council*, in *disertis verbis*, to affirm only this, *Purgatorium esse, animasque ibi detentas fidelium suffragiis, potissimum verò acceptabili Altaris Sacrificio juvari. Decret. de Purgatorio, Sess. 25.* But the *Popes* granting *Indulgences*,

Indulgences, and Priviledg'd Altars, Priests saying of Masses, and the Peoples praying, and giving Alms for the delivery of souls out of Purgatory, should better (an indifferent person would be apt to think) expound and declare the Churches sense, (or intention of Pastors, Parents, Tutors, Master of Families, and Nurses) of the word juvari, then any privat Doctor whatsoever. Yea, and if Master Whites Adversaries in this Point should urge, That there is a plain practical Tradition for the truth of the delivery of souls from Purgatory before the day of Judgement, by the help of Indulgences, Masses, Prayers, and Alms, it would have some difficulty in it to disprove them. For that the Members of the Roman Church, do not only generally use those things to that end and purpose, but were also taught by the preceding Age to do so, will not (I presume) be deny'd

160 *The several ways of resolving Faith*

deni'd ; so that unless they were told by the *Recommenders* of the *Practice*, that it was the *Product* of a *pious Opinion* only grounded on *probability*, (which I cannot conjecture any likelihood of being done by *Pastors*, *Parents*, *Guardians*, *Masters* of *Families*, and *Nurses*, who most commonly, rather press the *necessity* of what they teach, then otherwise) I apprehend not how they should imbrace it, save on the *same Terms* they did other *practical* things of their *Religion* which they judg'd to be of *Catholick use* and *necessity*.

A *third Instance*, shall be the *Doctrine* of *Transubstantiation*, which if it necessarily imply a *Contradiction*, is doubtless an *Error* ; and to prove it doth, I will, of many *Arguments* that might be urg'd, make use only of *two*, when I have first set down *three* things, which by the *Traditionists*, I am sure, by some of them, will

will be granted, to be *all* of them truths. The *first* is, That *Transubstantiation*, is a conversion of the Bread into the Body, and the Wine into the Blood of Christ. The *second* is, That a Body hath extension, or *partes extra partes*. The *third* thing is this, That *How many Hosts*, or consecrated Elements soever they be, Christ's Body is nevertheless but one. These three Propositions presuppos'd as true; I argue, That the *Doctrine* of *Transubstantiation* implies a *Contradiction*, in manner following.

Whosoever teacheth, That one and the same Body, may be equally extended, and not equally extended, at one and the same time, teacheth, in effect, a Contradiction to be true.

But whosoever teacheth the *Doctrine* of *Transubstantiation*, teacheth, that one and the same Body may be equally extended, and not equally extended at one and the same time. Ergo,

N

Who:

62. *The several ways of resolving Faith.*

Whosoever teacheth the Doctrine of Transubstantiation, teacheth, in effect, a Contradiction to be true.

The reason of the *Major* is this, *Corpus & quoquoqueversus extensum, vel quod habet partes extra partes*, signifie the same thing, and to be equally extended, and not equally extended, is one with this, to be extended to one and the same degree, and not be extended to one and the same degree, which to befall one and the same thing, at one and the same time, is certainly *contradictory*; since (in regard a *Body* and a *Thing* every way extended differ not) 'tis in effect to be one and the same thing and not one and the same thing at once, or the same thing not to be the same thing with it self.

The evidence for the truth of the *Minor* is no less then for that of the *Major*; for since according to the Doctrine of *Transubstantiation*, Christ's
Body

Body is every where *one* and the same *Body*, and the *consecrated Elements* are *many*, (either *Substances* or *Accidents*) 'twill follow, That as often as the *Elements* are at the same time of *different* sizes or bigness, the *Body* of *Christ*, which is neither *more* nor *less* extended on the *Altar* then the *Elements*, must be of an *unequal* bigness at the *same* time; or be *equally*, and *not-equally*, or just to *such* a degree, and not just to *such* a degree of bigness extended in *one* moment of time; For example, The *Body* of *Christ* under the *Elements* extended in *one* place to *two* degrees, and the *same* *Body* under the *Elements* extended in another place to *three* degrees, would be at the same time extended just to *two* degrees, and *not* just to *two* degrees; and likewise just to *three* degrees, and *not* just to *three* degrees; which to suppose a truth (seeing a *Body*, and a *Thing*

6. 10. 77
N 2
every

164 *The several ways of resolving Faith*

every way extended is the same) were to put a thing to be not the same thing which it is.

Another *Argument* is offer'd against *Transubstantiation* thus ;

To affirm *Christs Body* to be greater and less then it self at the same time, is, in effect, to affirm a Contradiction true.

But to affirm *Christs Body* to be in two or more distinct places at once, (as those who will defend *Transubstantiation* must do) is to affirm it to be greater and less then it self at the same time : *Ergo* ;

To affirm *Christs Body* to be in two, or more distinct places at once, is, in effect, to affirm a Contradiction true.

The truth of the *Major*, is clear from hence, That it is the same for a Body (or a thing extended) to be greater and less then it self at the same time, as to be, and not to be the same with

with it self; which is impossible.

And the *Minor* is equally certain, for since two distinct places are of larger extent then one, and that *locus* and *locatum* are *commensurat*; if one Body fill distinctly and apart one place, and yet, at the same time, fill another also, it will, of necessity, be greater and less then it self, whilst filling only one place, it will be less then it self filling two; and filling two, it will be greater then it self filling only one.

Some *Romansists* I know will make light of all this I have said against *Transubstantiation*, and think to confute it by flatly denying, that a *Body* and *Thing* extended is all one; but of such I would fain learn, what a *Body* then is, or how a *corporeal* substance, as such is distinguish'd from an *incorporeal*, a *material* from an *immaterial*, otherways then by *extension*, or having *partes extra partes*,
N 3 by

by which it is contiguous to the several distinct sides of the ambient Body or Bodies that encompass it; whereas an *incorporeal* or *immaterial* substance having no such parts, is of necessity *all together* wheresoever it is. If it were said, that a *material* substance is not of necessity *actually* extended, yet *naturally* capable of being so, which an *immaterial* is not; I desire to be resolv'd, whether by nature, and creation, there be or ever was, any *material substance* in the world without *extension*; if they yield (as I assure my self they will) there neither is, nor ever was; I shall take their concession for a grant, that it is a *natural* and innate property of *matter* to have *extension*, and consequently from thence infer; that if *Christs Body*, in the *Eucharist* be *unextended*, 'tis either an *immaterial* substance, that is, a *Spirit* and no *Body*; or els a *new kind of Being*, which is
ne.

neither *material* nor *immaterial*, since by *Creation*, all substances were either the one or the other, had *quantitative* parts or had *not*. If reply were made that *Christs Body* is *miraculously present* in the *Eucharist* by way of *substance*, (as *Aquinas* and others say it is) not including *material* nor *immaterial*, but *abstracting* from both ; I would *rejoyn*, and say, That the *existence* of *such a Being* is (to my apprehension) *impossible* ; for although in *Metaphysics*, *Philosophers* speak *abstractedly*, first of a *substance*, and afterwards difference it by *corporeal* and *incorporeal*. yet such discourse, doth not at all intend or suppose, that there either is, or can be, a *substance* really *existing*, which is neither of the *two* ; no more then from saying *animal est rationale, vel irrationale*, it can be presum'd, that an *animal* doth or may possibly *exist* and be neither *man* nor *brute*. The design

68 *The several ways of resolving Faith*

of inventing such general words as *substantia, animal, homo*, was not to make signs of any real or possible Being to be signified by them, but to contract and abbreviate mens discourse for the more ready understanding of one another; as for Instance, when we would signify in short, that *Peter, James, John*, and every other individual person in the world is of the same nature, to wit, a creature compounded of soul and body, endued with sense and Reason, a word is fram'd to comprehend and import all that, which is, *Homo, Man*; and then we affirm of *Peter*, of *James*, of *John* &c. that he is a *Man* in stead of saying he is a Creature compounded of *Soul and Body*, endued with *Sense and Reason*. When again it is observ'd wherein *Peter, James, John*, &c. agree with every singular Brute, a word is devis'd to denote that agreement, to wit, *animal*. And since it is
found

found that not only all these, but that also every corporeal and spiritual Thing whatsoever accords together in this, that they have a *Being subsisting of it self*, a word is us'd to shew that, which is *substantia* a substance; to avoid therefore the trouble of saying, *Peter, James, John &c. this horse, bird, fish, &c.* is a Thing that has a Being of it self, we contract it into this, *Peter, James, &c. this horse, bird, fish* is a substance; since then we see, that a Substance abstractedly taken, is not only void, but even incapable of all kind of existence, to say, *Christs Body* is present in the blessed Sacrament after the manner of a Substance, is to the same effect, as to say, That it is neither corporeally, nor incorporeally there present, that is, in verity not at all. But suppose we that *Christs Body* were present in the *Eucharist* without extension, and no other substance for the

Ac.

170 *The several ways of resolving Faith*

Accidents of Bread and Wine to *subsist* in; the *Accidents*, in such a case, must either *subsist* in *Christs Body*, and so *extension* be in a *Subject unextended*, which is plainly *contradictory*; or els, they must *subsist* of *themselves* without a *Subject*, which is equally *impossible*; for if we duly *reflect*, we shall find, That an *Accident* is not any *Thing* really differing from it's *Subject*, but a *meer Mode* only, or *manner* of it's *Being*, or an *appearance* of the *Subject*, under some *particular* consideration, as will (I think) by the following *Instance* evidently be seen; Take a piece of *Paste*, and mold it into several *forms* one after another, making it now *long*, then *round*, afterward *square*, and twill be no *thing* all the while, but the very *same Paste* still, under various *appearances*, which for *distinction* sake, we give different *appellations* to; so that to suppose
length,

length, roundness, squareness, (or long, round, square, take whether we please) really to exist, without some *Thing* which we denominate long, round, square, is to suppose the *meer mode* of a *Thing*, not to be the *meer mode* of a *Thing*, but a *Thing* of it self, which is utterly impossible. Many strange incredible things beside would follow, upon the supposal of the *Accidents* subsisting without a *Subject*, as that *they* are apt to do and suffer all things, which the *Bread* and *Wine* before their Transubstantiation were liable unto, as to nourish the Body, to be broken, to be split, to be corrupted, to be turn'd into ashes, smoke, &c. which seem to involve in them a contradiction also, in that a *meer accident*, which is *nothing*, should do and suffer *something*.

S E C T. XII.

That the Holy Scripture, or Written Word of God, is the Rule of Christian Faith. That Tradition is the best, and safest way and means, whereby to attain to the certain knowledge thereof. That the Multitude, or weakest sort of Christians are not able of themselves, without the help of others, to resolve Faith aright, or be rationally assur'd, what the Doctrine of Salvation is.

NOW, at length, having master'd all the difficulties in my Way, I see nothing of moment to obstruct or hinder me, why I may not from
the

the premis'd Discourse securely infer, That the *Sacred Scripture*, (i. e. *Such places* of it as contain the *necessario credenda*, and agenda of *Christ's Gospel*) is the *Rule of Christian Faith*; yet so, as that without the help of *Tradition*, it can neither be known to be the *Word of God*; nor when, in general, 'tis known so to be, any *rational* assurance can be had, That the *Texts* containing the *Necessaries* to *Salvation*, remain *uncorrupt*, but by the same *Tradition*; nor lastly, That those *Necessaries* to *Salvation*, can be manifested *what they are*, save as *Tradition* guides unto, and gives notice of them. All which, if I have been clear in the proof of, he that goes about to seek for the *Rule of Faith* and makes not *Tradition* his *chief* and *best Assistant*, shall never have any *rational* ground of *certainty*, that he has met with it, and *explicitly* knows the *Contents* of it.

74 *The several ways of resolving Faith*

it, even though perchance he have really and indeed found it and peradventure *explicitly* believes whatsoever is contain'd in it.

If it be so difficult a thing, as it seems to be, by what hath been sayd, to *resolve Faith* aright, or to make such use o' *Scripture*, as to be *certainly* inform'd by it of *Christs Doctrin*, without danger of *erring* or being *mistaken*, it might be demanded, how the *generality* of *Christians* should be able of *themselves* to do it. True, but such demand, as it would be reasonable and pertinent if the *Multitude* were oblig'd to learn the *Christian Religion* of *themselves*, *immediatly* from *Scripture*; so on the contrary, if they have no obligation to do it, 'tis neither the one nor the other. And ~~that~~ no such obligation lies upon ~~them~~, the *unpracticableness* (to say no worse) of the thing, manifested in
the

the *sixt Section* of this *Treatise*, sufficiently testifies. We must then, would some say, *pin* (it seems) our *Faith* on *others sleeves*. To wave that *catachrestical* effeminate speech, let's put the *Question* more manlike and fairly thus, Whether the *generality* of the People must not of necessity rely on *others Learning* and *Fidelity*, in coming to the *knowledge* of *Christs Doctrin*; And my *Answer* then is, That there is no possible way of avoiding it without a continued *Miracle* of *immediat Revelation*, but that most certainly they must, and 'twas and ever will be so. For *first*, if we look back towards the begining of the *Gospel*, we shall find that the *New Testament* was writ by the *Apostles* and *Evangelists* in *Greek*, which *Tongue*, though granted to have been the most generally known of any one, then in the *Eastern Parts*; yet, that every third *Christian* understood

stood that *Language*, is not at all to be thought on. *Secondly*, Nor was the *Scripture* presently *Translated* into every *Tongue*, where there were those who imbrac'd *Christianity*. *Thirdly*, Neither could poor *Mechanicks*, *Labourers*, *Servants*, and *Slaves* procure it, when *Translated*, before the ready way of *Printing* was *Invented*; because, 'twas not formerly a little money that would buy both, or even one of the *Testaments*. *Fourthly*, Neither yet, if all *Christians* had had wherewith to buy, would there have been, till the *Art* of *Printing* was found, *Books* enough for half, or a quarter of them. *Fifthly*, Suppose we now, that by means of the *Press*, every one has, or might have, a *Bible* in their *native Tongue*; How is it possible, that the *vulgar* should know of themselves that it is the *Word* of *God*? that it has been kept free from *corruption* in things of necessary *Be-
lie*

in the Roman and Reformed Churches.

lief and Practice? that it is *faithfully* Translated out of the *Originals*? that considering what variety of *Doctrins* are in it; and in how many places dispers'd; they should be able, and at leisure, to cull out of it a *Summary* of *Fundamentals*; (in case the thing it self were attainable without other helps besides *Scripture*) seeing *millions* of them are necessitated to spend their whole time almost, to get a poor *Livelihood* for themselves and Families? that they should be able to compare places of *Scripture* so effectually; as rightly to compose *seeming Contradictions* in *Points* of *Faith*, thereby, when not without difficulty they are got to understand, but ordinarily well; even plain and common things? Who so shall seriously reflect on these matters, will doubtless think it strangely unbecoming *Mans* most *gracious Maker*, and *Redeemer*; to require at the hands of the poor

78 *The several ways of resolving Faith*

ignorant people to pick out their Religion of themselves from Holy Scripture, or to depend upon their own weak performances, for finding out the true sense and interpretation of it. For (over and above what has been already shewn for the unreasonableness of the thing) after this be first well weigh'd, in the balance of sound Reason, that the Multitude must of necessity trust others, for the truth of the Translation of Scripture, let an irrefragable Reason be given by any that can, why they should not aswell, and might as safely give credit to those for the sense of it, who are in prudence to be entrusted by reason of their Knowledge and Honesty for recommending to them the sincerity of the Version, since 'tis to be presum'd they understand it to be a true translation no further, when they know the sense of the words translated. Not-with-

withstanding the plain verity of what has here been said, 'tis not unknown, how frequently and vehemently some popular men use to cry out to the people from the *Pulpit*, Believe not us, believe the *Scripture*, as if the meanest of their *Auditors* were thought by them to be the proper *Judges* of the *Scripture* sense; amongst the rest. But though their words seem to import as much, if we look to the bottom of the business, we shall discover, That even these *Preachers* must acknowledge, they intend otherwise; or els confess their design in doing it is unlawful. For when they say, Believe not us, believe the *Scripture*; they either intend the *Texts* they quote for a *Proof* of what they touch; or they do not. If they intend them for a *Proof*, their meaning must be this; believe us, yet not for our own sakes, but for the *Scriptures*; that is, believe us, because we teach the very

same Doctrine which the *Scripture* doth ; or believe the *Scripture* to the *same* intent and purpose, or in the *same* sense we alledge it, for to believe it in any *other*, would not have the effect of a *Proof* with them. But if they have no intention to use the *Scriptures* they quote to *prove* what they Preach, let them inform us to what *other good* intent they do it, for I cannot think of any. To several *bad ends*, 'tis obvious enough to conceive how it may be done ; as out of *covetousness*, or through the desire of *applause*, or for promoting a *faction*, to *humour* and *gratify* the people they Preach unto. But for none of *these* ends will they yield, I am well assur'd, they do it ; and therefore I see no way to avoid it, but that the *Quotations* must be granted to be produc'd for *Proofs* and consequently, that the persons using them have no *real* design by
 say

saying, beleeve not *us*, beleeve the *Scripture*, that the *truth* of their *Doctrine* should stand, or fall, accordingly as their *Auditors* judge it consonant, or disagreeing to the *places* of *Holy Writ* which they're directed to, for *examination* and *tryal* of the *verity* of what their *Teachers* deliver, as they themselves often (I beleeve) apprehend ; but for *Proof* and *confirmation* indeed of the *Doctrine* taught, according to the intendment of the *Preacher*.

Some perhaps would here be encourag'd to assert, that this which I have last discours'd, concerning *Holy Writ*, (*viz.* that the *Multitude* cannot without better help then their own, make right use of *Scripture*, as 'tis the *Rule of Faith*) makes for *Oral Tradition*, which instructs every one from the *Prince* to the *Peasant* in all the *Articles* of *Christian Faith*. To such I should answer,

282 *The several ways of resolving Faith*

That *Tradition* could no more be made use of as the *Rule of Faith* (supposing it were so) by the People, without the assistance of some more *skilful* then themselves, then *Scripture* can. For *first*, They must trust *others*, that what they are instructed in by their *immediat* Teachers, is the *sense* of the present *Catholick Church*. *Secondly*, They must have it from better *Arguments* then themselves can frame, That the *Doctrine* of the present *Church* is the very *same* with the *Doctrine* of the *Church* in all foregoing *Ages* since *Christ*. *Thirdly*, They must beleieve *others*, That *Tradition* is the *alone Rule of Faith*, for the *Multitude* (I may safely say) is not so quick sighted, as clearly to see, that there's no other way to come to a right knowledge of *Christs Doctrine*, but by an *Oral Delivery* of it. So that in fine, I am much assur'd, That the *Rule of Faith* was

was never intended by God for the *Multitude* to resolve immediately of themselves the *Christian Faith* into; and that therefore the *Destitution* of *Ecclesia docens, & discens* is good; yea, necessary to be practically maintain'd and upheld among *Christians*; To the former of which (I mean the *Ecclesia docens*) consisting of *Prelats* and *Pastors*, the *Depositum*, or *Rule of Faith*, is principally (not solely, because it is lawful for any to make good use of it that can) entrusted; for that in reason, the *Clergy* is justly presum'd to be fittest, both for *Skill* and *Will*, to understand it aright, and to employ it to it's due *End*, whilst they can want no *Helps* possible to be had for gaining the true sense of it; and that it is the *Main* of their *Employ*, for which they are called to their *Sacred Office*, to use and exercise the same to it's proper *End*; whereas others, generally speak-

84. The several ways of resolving Faith

ing neither, have the *like* advantages to understand it as it ought to be, nor so *great* Motives and Obligation to promote the true *intendment* and *design* thereof.

Have not then the People, even every particular person of them, it might well be ask'd, a *Judgement* of *Discretion* in the choice and matters of *Religion*? If by *Judgement* of *Discretion* be meant, That they are to do nothing, but what they themselves *approve* of; I readily yield they have. But in case they set themselves to *oppose* their *own* Judgement to the Judgment of the *Clergy* in *Matters* of *Faith*, their *Judgment* will be found a *Judgment* of intolerable and pernicious *Indiscretion*. For to make a true discovery of an *Error* in *Faith*, the *Rule* of *Faith* must be well consulted, and the *Point* in *question* duly *apply'd* to't, to be *try'd* by it; so that if either the *Rule*
it

it self be *mistaken*, or the *Thing* to be regulated by it, be not *rightly* apply'd, no *Doctrine* concerning *Faith* can *rationally* be discover'd, whether it be an *Error*, or a *Truth*. And 'tis ridiculously absurd, to think, that the vulgar sort consisting of *Servants*, *Labourers*, *Mechanicks*, and others, generally busied and spending their days about *Temporal* affairs, should be more sufficient, and able, to understand the *Rule of Faith* aright, and to apply things doubred of thereto, so as truly to determine of their *rectitude* or *obliquity* by it, then the grave and Learned *Prelats*, with the profound *Doctors*, and others of the more *Ancient* and *Reverend* *Divines*, who have spent many of them *thirty*, several of them *fourty*, and some amongst them *fifty* years, or more, in the study (for the most part) of *sacred Learning*, being legally also call'd to the *Office* of *teaching* and

186 *The several ways of resolving Faith*

directing Mankind as *Christian*, by a *Mission* successively deriv'd from *Christ* and his *Apostles*, which none besides the *Clergy*, how *Learned* or *Pious* soever, can justly make claim to. Would it not then astonish, and work compassion in any man of sobriety, to see the ignorant people grossly misled, to believe, They are able enough of *themselves* to understand the *Scripture*, in all things necessary to *Salvation*, when as 'tis principally for instructing them aright in those very things, and keeping them to the due observance of them, that they have *Spiritual Guides* and *Governours* set over them by *God*, and his *Holy Church*? Which yet they are many of them poor souls, being strangely infatuated with a conceit of their own endowments, so farr from having any regard to, that although they dayly see before their eyes, That the wise and gracious *God*, in the

in the Roman and Reformed Churches.

the Oeconomy of his great Family, the World, has provided and placed several men *skill'd* in several things; some in Civil Government, some in *Laws*, some in *Physick*, and others in *other Professions*, all for the Good of the Community in assisting men in those things, wherein they are presum'd not to have *skill enough* to do the *best* for themselves; yet nevertheless, they will not understand and discern a necessity of some *skilfuller* than they themselves be, to advise, direct, and order them in those *grand Matters*, which are of more *Weighty* and *lasting* Concern to them, then *all* the things in the whole World besides; but in contradiction to the *Analogy* of *Providence* seen round about them, despising those, who ought to have the *oversight* of their *Belief* and *Manners*, make themselves their own *Instructors* and *Rulers* in the Learning and Manage-

288 *The several ways of resolving Faith*
Management of those things, wherein
if they finally miscarry, they are
ruin'd to eternity.

S E C T. XIII.

*The harme that may arise to the
Church, from the belief of an
Error not-Fundamental, to be
an Article of Faith. The true
stating of the difference, between
the Church of England, and the
Church of Rome. Whether or
no the Church of England be
justly accus'd of criminal Schism?
That the joynt Concurrence of
Scripture, and Oral Tradition,
(or the practical Delivery of
Christ*

in the Roman and Reformed Churches. 1

*Christ Doctrine) was recommend-
ed by the Apostles to the Church;
the Restauration of which Con-
currence ('tis humbly conceiv'd)
would be a firm Foundation for
re-uniting dissenting Christians
in Matters of Religion; and
the Continuance of it a lasting
Means for perpetuating Chri-
stianity in 'its ancient native
Purity.*

I have now only one *Scruple* more
remaining, concerning *Matters of
Faith*, and it arises from what my
self concluded before, which was,
That no *Fundamental Error* could
ever get a *setled footing* without dis-
turbance, but should perpetually meet
with *opposition* from *Orthodox Chri-
stians*, so that all *necessary Truths*,
shall be continually nourish'd in the
Bosom of the visible Church. In
which

90 *The several ways of resolving Faith*

which if I have said right, what harm, may it with great appearance of reason be ask'd, can be found to accrew upon it, if an *Error*; not *fundamental* chance to creep into the *Church*, and grow by degrees to be held at length an *Article of Faith*, seeing the *belief* thereof is not in it's self destructive of *Salvation*? I answer, there is this great harm in it, if no other, that in case it at any time come to be discover'd, and *National Churches* be thereupon divided about it, *one* holding it to be an *Article of Faith* another taking it to be an *Erroneous Doctrine*, there will unavoidably a *Schism* happen upon it, because that *Church* which thinks it to be an *Article of Faith*, will conceive herself oblig'd to deny *Communion* to the other, which rejects it as an *Error*; and that other which rejects it as an *Error*, must needs judge it to be an *heinous Sin*,

to acknowledge and profess that *She* beleeves a *Doctrin* to be an *Article* of *Faith*, which in truth *she* holds to be an *Erroneous Opinion*; and yet without such acknowledgment, and answerable profession, she cannot be admitted to *Communion* with the *Church*, that believes it to be an *Article* of *Faith*. Upon this very account it is, that the *Divisions* between the *Church* of *Rome*, and *Church* of *England*, as to the *Doctrinal Part* of *Religion* are continued; for I find, that the most cautious and wary *Vindicators* of the *English Church* from the guilt of *Schism*, which the *Romanists* incessantly accuse her of, allege in excuse for her *Separation*, that the *Church* of *Rome* requires as necessary *Conditions* of her *Communion*, the acknowledgment of some erroneous *Doctrins* to be *Articles* of *Faith*, together with a publick profession of them; which *Doctrins*

192 *The several ways of resolving Faith*

Errors, although not dampable in their own nature, because not directly repugnant to any Fundamental Truth, yet would become damnable to those who judging them to be Errors, should acknowledge and profess them, contrary to their Judgments, to be Articles of Faith. To this purpose writes the learned Bishop Montague; the renowned Arch-Bishop Laud, Doctor Ferne, Doctor Hammond, the late Lord Primat of Ireland Bishop Bramhall, with others; whereunto I'll add one Controvertist more, of the present time. Doctor Stillingfleet, of which two last mentioned (not to multiply needless quotations about a thing so well known. I'll here transcribe two Passages; It was not (saith the learned Primate) the erroneous Opinions of the Church of Rome, but the obtruding them by Laws upon other Churches; which warranted a separation. Bishop Bramhalls Vindica-

in the Roman and Reformed Churches:

dedication against Mr. Baxter, Pag. 101. This is clearly the state of the difference, (saith Doctor Stillingfleet) between the Church of Rome; and Church of England. The Church of Rome imposeth new Articles of Faith to be believ'd as necessary to Salvation, as appears, &c. But the Church of England makes no Articles of Faith, but such as have the Testimony and Approbation of the whole Christian World of all Ages; and are acknowledg'd to be such by Rome it self; and in other things she requires subscription, not as Articles of Faith, but as inferior Truths, which she expects a submission to, in order to her peace and tranquillity: Thus the ingenious Doctor in his Rational account of the Grounds of Protestant Religion, Pag. 54. The Church of England then by this, holding nothing to be an
P Article

The several ways of resolving Faith

Article of Faith, but what *Rome* it self acknowledges to be so; it's evident; That if the *Church of England* believe all the *Articles of Catholick Faith*, as she professes she doth, the *Church of Rome* does likewise the same; and consequently, since every *Fundamental Truth* is an *Article of Catholick Faith*, that she believes all *Fundamental Truths*, no less then the other doth. So that the true and real difference between those two *Churches*, is not about *Fundamentals*, but *Superstructures*, which if they be *Errors*, or any of them, (as I think some of them are prov'd to be in *Self*, i. e. and if it were necessary, others, I conceive, might be) the imposing of them as *Articles of Faith* by the *Romish Church* layes the gale of *Schisme* at her door. But that it ever will be granted by the *Romanists*, while they esteem the *Living Voice* of the
the

in the Roman and Reformed Churches. 1

The Church the Rule of Faith, and hold the Council of Trent to be a true Representative of the Church, that she proposes any Errors as Articles of Catholick Faith, is not to be expected. And that they'll yield to change their pretended Rule of Faith, there's small encouragement yet to hope, since 'tis true aswell of them, as of too many others, what the rational *Animadverter* upon the Pamphlet entituled, *The naked Truth*, rightly observes, That *Political Authors commonly oppose those Passages in their Adversaries Books, which are ready to fall of themselves, and pass by those which urge and press them harder.* If it were not too truly so, 'twould be a matter of great amazement to me, That *Scripture and Tradition* should still be cryed up one against the other, and made to look as if they were at en-

29 *The several ways of resolving Faith*

mity, when 'tis manifestly clear, that God at first joyn'd them amiably together, in that the *Blessed Apostles* and *Evangelists* recommended the *Holy Gospel*, or *Revelation of Jesus Christ the Son of God*, both in *Writing*, and by an *Oral Delivery*, and *practical Profession* of it to the *World*, designing them, no doubt, to go hand in hand for *Instructing*, *Confirming*, and *Regulating Men* in the *Belief* and *Practice of Christianity*, till the end of all things. And therefore, till their *joynt Concurrence* be restor'd to the *Church*, I see not what great Good we can rationally expect by *Controversie*; whereas, if due respect and regard were had to both, the *Issue* and *Event* thereof would, as it appears in reason to me, be this. That *nothing* father'd on *Scripture* could be assented to, and receiv'd as a Ca-

Abso-

tholick Point of Faith, unless there were likewise found a practical Tradition of it in the Church; nor any Doctrine be taken and held for a Catholick Tradition, but what was evidently seen by the Chief of the Clergy at least, to have a real Ground in Holy Writ; whence the Christian Religion ('tis humbly conceiv'd) might be in a certain way (whensoever Interest or Passion prevented nor) to be secur'd from Error and the Church from Schism.

F I N I S.
